



3 1761 06891670 9

Isaac Lopham Esq
with the autograph of the
12th THE
MAYNOOTH GRANT (43) I

CONSIDERED

RELIGIOUSLY, MORALLY, AND POLITICALLY;

WITH

DOCUMENTARY PROOF

THAT IT WAS ORIGINALLY OBTAINED BY

FRAUD AND PERJURY;

AND THAT

ITS CONTINUANCE IS A SUBSIDY TO

IDOLATRY AND SEDITION.

INCLUDING

Extracts from the most celebrated speeches delivered on the subject in
the House of Commons in the various sessions from 1807 to 1845.

AND IN

AN ADDENDA AND APPENDIX,

A PRACTICAL EXEMPLIFICATION OF ITS EFFECTS IN

"THE SAYINGS AND DOINGS"

OF THE ROMISH PRIESTS AND PRELATES OF IRELAND DURING
THE RECENT ELECTION, AS GIVEN IN DETAIL.

BY

PHILIP DIXON HARDY, M.R.I.A.

Author of "Ireland in 1846-7." "The Progress of the Confessional, or the Doctrines taught
in Maynooth." "The History of the Inquisition." "The Genius of Popery."
"The Holy Wells of Ireland," &c. &c. &c.

DUBLIN:

PHILIP DIXON HARDY AND SONS,
23, UPPER SACKVILLE-STREET.

LONDON: R. B. BLACKADER, 13, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

BX
920
M36-437

“When England shall lose her hostility to Popery, neither her liberties nor greatness can long survive.”—*Speech of Mr. Secretary Walpole, 1761.*

“Every encouragement of the Papal power is a diminution of the power and authority of the crown.”—*Blackstone.*

TO THE

RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ABERDEEN.

First Lord of Her Majesty's Treasury.

MY LORD,

I have the honour to submit, for your Lordship's consideration, the following pamphlet, on the Grant to the College of Maynooth; and although the greater portion of it was written and printed off while the Earl of Derby occupied the high position now held by your Lordship, I feel persuaded the facts brought forward are sufficient to induce even "a Liberal Conservative Government," who would wish to support the British Constitution in its integrity, without one hour's delay to withdraw the Grant from Maynooth. I beg leave, therefore, most respectfully to solicit your Lordship's especial attention to the facts referred to.

You will perceive, my Lord, I have not entered into any questions concerning particular governments—but having proved distinctly, by documentary evidence, that the Grant to Maynooth was obtained by fraud and perjury—having demonstrated that no one of the benefits originally promised by the establishment of May-

LETTER.

nooth has been obtained—and Lord John Russell himself, in arguing the question in the House of Commons, having admitted that no compact exists with reference to the Grant which should prevent Parliament from at once withdrawing it, provided it could be shewn that it is productive of evil to the community at large*—I now, having given ample proof that such is and has for many years been the case—as a British subject, respectfully but earnestly call upon your Lordship, and your Lordship's coadjutors in office, to exert your influence in the abatement of an evil, detrimental to the great body of Her Majesty's subjects of every denomination, more especially to the lower orders of the Roman Catholic population.

I have the honour to be,

My Lord,

Your Lordship's very obedient Servant,

PHILIP DIXON HARDY.

Dublin, January 26th, 1853.

* See page 100, Lord John Russell's speech in 1846.

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The real questions to be considered in reference to Maynooth .	1
First—What were the purposes for which the Grant was originally made, and under what particular circumstances was it made?	1
Humble Memorial of the Roman Catholic Prelates in 1794, to be allowed to erect Seminaries for the education of ecclesiastics, and to secure funds for the purpose	3
Extract from Act of Parliament granting prayer of Memorial .	6
Reasons assigned for so doing	7
Correspondence between Mr. Pitt and the Pope's Secretary .	9
Real causes of extra-official courtesy	10
Copy of the Queries addressed by order of Mr. Pitt to Six Foreign Universities, relative to the authority of the Pope in Great Britain, and their answers	13
Fatuity of the British Minister	14
The real tenets of the Romish Church, as stated by Plowden, Dr. Troy, &c.	16
Double game played by the Church of Rome	20
Real state of the case	22
Petition of Roman Catholic Laity against the establishing of Maynooth	24
Maynooth established by Romish Ecclesiastics to rear a body of men for the priesthood, independent of the people	26
Character of the old Irish priest educated on the Continent .	28
Description of the priests educated in Maynooth	29
It was not originally required or designed to educate the priests in Maynooth out of the public purse	29
Statements in Houses of Lords and Commons on this point .	30
Second proposition considered, viz.—Was it in accordance with the principles of the British Constitution to make a Grant of the public money to Maynooth?	34
Mr. Pitt grossly deceived by statements of Romish Ecclesiastics	36
Opinion of the Right Hon. John Foster on the subject .	37
Lord Clare and Dr. Duigenan's opinions	39
Original rules relative to Maynooth altered in consequence of the interference of Edmund Burke and Dr. Hussey	42
The peculiar doctrines of the Romish Church as taught in Maynooth	44
" <i>The Bill of Rights</i> " and the Oath of the King or Queen of Great Britain directly opposed to such doctrines	45
Curious fact relative to the declaration made by Romanists abjuring certain principles of the Romish religion	47

CONTENTS.

	Page.
The Grant to Maynooth unjust in principle and unwise in policy	49
Third proposition considered, viz.—Have the purposes for which Maynooth was professedly established, been attained or ac- complished?	50
The negative distinctly proved	51
Opinion of respectable Roman Catholics in 1812 relative to May- nooth	52
Real designs of Romanists at that day identical with the present	54
Perfidy of the Romish Ecclesiastics proved by their oaths and disclaimers from 1792 to 1829	56
Perjury of Mr. Daniel O'Connell and other Members of Parlia- ment	57
Perjury of Romish Bishops and Archbishops	58
Letters of Dr. Doyle	59
Letters of John of Tuam	60
Religious Equality Committee	62
Maynooth proved to be an unmitigated curse to Ireland	64
Description of education given to students in Maynooth	66
Unmixed ultramontaniam inculcated	69
Priests educated in France might be loyal—those educated in Maynooth could not be	70
Testimony of Professor Anglade, Dr. M'Hale, and Dr. Doyle	71
Their evidence supported by Rev. Mr. Dixon as to oaths, the Pope's deposing power, and the Church's jurisdiction over heretics	72
The various rebellions fomented by Romish priests	75
No one of the objects proposed in establishing Maynooth at- tained or accomplished	76
Fourth query—Act relative to Maynooth amended in 1800	77
Analysis of Speeches delivered in the House of Commons on the Maynooth question by the more celebrated members during the various Sessions from 1807 to 1845	78
Mr. Perceval	78
Sir John Newport—Mr. Grattan—Lord Mahon—Mr. Wilber- force	79
Mr. Hawkins Browne—Mr. Wyndham—The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Foster—Sir Arthur Wellesley	80
Mr. Ponsonby—The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Grattan	81
Mr. Croker—Colonel Montague Matthew—The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Wilberforce	82
Mr. Laing—Dr. Duigenan—Sir John Newport—Mr. Secretary Ryder—Mr. Grattan	83
The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Sir H. Parnell	84

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Sir J. C. Hippesley—Mr. Wyse—Mr. Lefroy—Mr. James Gordon—Mr. O'Connell	86
Sir Robert Inglis—Mr. O'Connell—Lord Killeen—Mr. Spring Rice—Mr. Perceval	87
Mr. Secretary Ryder—Mr. Stanley—Lord Mandeville	88
Mr. Maurice O'Connell—Lord Ingestre—Mr. Shiel—Mr. Sinclair	89
Mr. Spring Rice—Mr. Cutter Ferguson—Mr. Baldwin—The Earl of Galloway—Mr. Plumptre—Viscount Morpeth	90
Sir Robert Inglis	91
Mr. Sheil—Mr. Litton—Mr. H. G. Wood—Sir Robert Peel	92
Mr. M. J. O'Connell—Mr. Colquhoun	93
Mr. O'Connell	95
Mr. Sergeant Jackson	96
Sir Robert Peel	97
Sir Robert Inglis	98
Mr. Gregory—Viscount Sandon	99
Mr. Plumptre—Lord John Russell	100
Mr. Cumming Bruce—Mr. Shiel	101
Mr. T. Duncombe—Sir Robert Peel—Mr. Colquhoun	102
Sir H. Parnell and the members acting with him deceived by the priests	105
Fallacy of their arguments demonstrated	105
Speech of Sir John Wilson Croker in 1819	105
Mr. Justice Blackstone's opinion	106
<i>Expediency</i> the only argument of the friends of Maynooth	107
Maynooth has no legitimate claim whatever for a Grant of public money	108
Mr. Grattan's arguments	109
Sir Robert Peel's measure supported by a monstrous coalition	110
What has been the result?	111
Gratitude of the Romanists	112
The Defence Association	112
Appointment of Paul Cullen as Primate of Armagh, a violation of the rules for the appointment of Roman Catholic Bishops	113
What has become of the guarantee given to the Government on this point	114
Relative Number of Protestants and Romanists greatly changed within the last few years	114
Protestants, like children of Israel, have greatly increased	114
No fear in case of a rebellion	115
No necessity now exists for educating Roman Catholic Priests	115
List of Roman Catholic Colleges in Ireland	115

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Large sums collected for Popish purposes	116
Dr. Doyle's evidence	116
No necessity now for an establishment like Maynooth	117
Number of Priests educated in Maynooth far beyond require- ments of Ireland	117
Mr. O'Connell's testimony	117
Number of Priests educated in Kilkenny, Carlow, Waterford, and Wexford	118
Testimony of the <i>Tablet</i>	118
The Roman Catholic body well able to pay for the education of their priests	119
Maynooth a signal failure	120
Amount expended during twenty years on the erection of Ro- man Catholic ecclesiastical buildings in Dublin	120
Conclusion—Doctrines and principles inculcated in Maynooth	121
Specimens of the <i>morality</i> ! and <i>loyalty</i> inculcated in Maynooth	123
Extracts from the Maynooth Class Books, shewing their atroci- ous character	124
Protean character of Popery exhibited in Maynooth	126
No certainty attainable as to what is actually taught in May- nooth	127
The education given to the Priests in Maynooth has produced the present disgraceful state of things in Ireland	128
Impurities of the Confessional advocated by the Editor of the <i>Tablet</i>	128
Fruits of instruction given in Maynooth become more and more apparent year after year	129
The great body of the Maynooth Priests were implicated in the various rebellions	132
Opinion of Dr. O'Connor on this point	132
Ireland could not possibly present any other than its present ap- pearance under such circumstances	133
The priests have never exercised their power to repress crime, or bring the criminal to justice	135
The peasantry become hardened in guilt in consequence of the teachings of the Maynooth priests	136
The interference of the priests the cause of Absenteeism	137
The difference so perceptible between the inhabitants in the north and in the other portions of Ireland traceable to the difference in the religion of the people	139
Statistics of crime	139
Wherever Popery prevails, crime, and wretchedness and misery are the attendants	140

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Shall assistance be given to educate men who are the means of doing so much mischief in the country	140
"The <i>Extinction of Protestantism</i> " declared by the Earl of Arundel to be the object Romanists have in view	142
Are the Protestants of Great Britain prepared to assist in such an object by continuing the Grant to Maynooth	143
Our forefathers solemnly renounced Popery, and it is the duty of the Queen and any Government she appoints to do the same	143
The cry should now be raised from one end of the country to the other, "down with Popery, it is the bane of Ireland's prosperity"	144
Lord Derby and the various members of the late Government should continue to pursue a straightforward course on this particular point, and the result will be that within a few months they will hold a much more commanding position in the British Senate than they recently did.	144

ADDENDA.

Sayings and Doings of the Romish Priests during the recent elections	145
The state of Ireland as it now is, exactly portrayed forty years ago in a reply to the speech of the Right Hon. C. Plunket in the House of Commons	146

LEINSTER.

DUBLIN.

Intolerance of the Priests in the Co. of Dublin during the recent election—Electors denounced in the Chapels	147
--	-----

KILDARE.

Movement of the Priests	147
Priestly doings at Castlecomer	148

MEATH.

Altar denunciations	148
Treatment of Mr. H. Grattan	148
Father Kelch and Mr. John Reynolds	149
Real feelings of the more respectable Roman Catholic laity	150

WESTMEATH.

Dr. Cantwell's circular to the Priests	151
Correspondence between Priest Coghlan and Mr. W. B. Smythe	153

DUNDALK.

Inflammatory speech of Priest Kernan	153
--	-----

CONTENTS.

Page.

KING'S CO.

Doings of the mob under direction of the Priests	155
Fearful anathemas of the Priests	157
Brutal attack on Mr. Bernard's voters	158
Specimen of the undue influence exercised by the priests over the people	159
Infamous conduct of the Priests after the election . . .	160
Voters denounced by the Priests in the public streets . .	162
Voters cursed from the altar	162
Assault in a Roman Catholic Chapel	163
Exertions of the Priests to coerce the people into the belief that the Protestant gentry must be exterminated	165
Evidence against the Priests at Parsonstown Petty Sessions .	166
Audacious efforts of the Priests to tyrannize over the people .	167
Threatened suspension of the rites of the Church to voters, by priests of superior intelligence	168

CARLOW.

Unexampled excitement created by the Roman Catholic clergy	169
Disgraceful outrage	169
Priestly counsel to the people	170
Attack on the police at Mass	170

LONGFORD.

A mob of not less than eight thousand collected by the priests .	171
Hundreds of tenants compelled to vote against their landlords by the priests	171
Address of the Priests	172

ULSTER.

DOWN.

Doings of the Ribbonmen and the Priests	173
A Priest fighting in disguise	173
Their efforts unavailing in consequence of the energy of the ma- gistrates	175

MONAGHAN.

Dr. Gray and the Tenant Leaguers	176
--	-----

DERRY.

The Priests and Tenant Leaguers used positive compulsion .	177
Priestly intimidation introduced into Derry	177

DONEGAL.

Terrorism and lawless intimidation proved fruitless . . .	179
Mr. Conolly's speech	181

CONTENTS.

CONNAUGHT.

Page.

SLIGO.

Opposition of the Priests to the landlords . . .	183
--	-----

MAYO.

Exclusive dealing enforced	184
The Priests are playing a desperate game . . .	185
Dr. McHale at Achill	185
Houses of Protestants burned	186
Trial and conviction of a Priest at the Achill Sessions, for an as- sault on a Scripture Reader	189

GALWAY.

Dreadful scene at the election	191
Inflammatory speech of Father Macklin	192
A brutal and sanguinary mob hired to assault and insult every one who voted in favor of Protestants	193
Dr. McHale's speech to the Electors of Galway . . .	194

MUNSTER.

CORK.

Assault on the Conservative Electors of Cork, and demolition of their houses	195
Fearful proceedings of the mob under direction of the Priests .	197
Described by Colonel Chatterton	198
Frightful results of the feelings raised at the election . .	201

TIPPERARY.

Infamous conduct of the Priests	202
Priestly Placards	203
Lots of Priests in the booths	204

LIMERICK.

Attack on the military at Six-mile-bridge	205
Inquest on those shot during the engagement . . .	206
Result of the inquest	207
Opinion of the <i>Times</i> on the transaction	208
Letter of Pierse Creagh, Esq.	209
Twenty voters denounced by name	209
Notice of 31st regiment	210
Solemn Office and High Mass for the men shot at Six-mile-bridge	211

WATERFORD.

Meeting of Romish Clergy held at the residence of the Roman Catholic Bishop	213
Upwards of 2000 voters deterred from coming to the poll .	214
Names of electors placarded as "black sheep" . . .	214

CONTENTS.

	Page.
Extraordinary scene with a Priest at Ardmore . . .	215
YOUGHAL.	
Mr. Butt's election	216

Priests who nominated or seconded members . . .	217
The three great causes which rendered the priesthood powerful for evil traceable to Lord John Russell . . .	217
The rites of the Church refused to electors—from the Times .	219

APPENDIX.

A fair specimen of the Priests of Ireland—call for a Romish crusade against England	221
The late Mr. Thomas Moore's opinion of Popery . . .	222
Dying declaration of the celebrated William Lord John Russell	223
All the Ribbonmen are Roman Catholics . . .	223
The Provincial Synod at Oscott—from the Times . .	224
Appointment of Paul Cullen, <i>an alien</i> , to the Roman Catholic Primacy	225
The Bible in Maynooth College	227
The Class Books of Maynooth—copies of books written by the Jesuits	228
Irish College in Paris	229
Amount of Roman Catholic expenditure in Canada . .	229
Opposition of the Priests to the laws of the land . .	230
Popery in Ireland—as it was, and as it is	
Statement of John O'Connell, Esq.	230
Statement of Professor Edgar, Belfast	231
Intolerant spirit of Popery—from the Times . . .	233
Conviction of a Roman Catholic Priest for assaulting a female .	235
Brutal conduct of a popish mob	236
Specimen of Priestly intolerance	237
Persecution of Scripture Readers	237
Insolent conduct of Father Healy	239
A Priest held to bail in the sum of £10 for his <i>good</i> behaviour .	240
Persecuting principles of Popery—from the Times . .	242
The RELIGION of the ANCIENT IRISH	244
Extracts from an epitome of Irish History, as given in " <i>Religious Statistics of Ireland</i> ," by P. D. Hardy, M.R.I.A.	245
Opinion of Mr. Thomas Moore	245
Opinion of Dr. Chalmers	250
Roman Catholics shewn to have no claim on the Church property of Ireland	250

MAYNOOTH.

AFTER all that has been written on the subject of the Government Grant to the Roman Catholic College of Maynooth, it appears, on a careful consideration of the subject, that the real questions to be considered in reference to that Institution, are—

First—What were the purposes for which the Grant was originally made, and under what particular circumstances and conditions was it made ?

Second—Was it right or proper, or in accordance with the great principles of the British Constitution, to give a grant of the public money for the establishment of such an Institution ?

Third—Have the purposes for which Maynooth was professedly established been attained or accomplished ?

Fourth—Under present circumstances, after the experience of more than half a century, especially after the experience of the last three years, would it not be a dereliction of duty, a breach of the great trust reposed in the hands of the Government, were they to assent to the continuance of the Grant for another year ?

Whatever collateral questions may be involved in

the discussion, these we think are the real issues on which public opinion must pronounce its judgment.

No doubt most of those who take an interest in such subjects are already aware of the reasons which originally led to the establishment of Maynooth College. For the information of others, it may be necessary very briefly to refer to a few of the facts and circumstances connected with its establishment.

For about a century previous to the era of the French Revolution in 1794, by the laws in force in Great Britain and Ireland, the establishment or endowment of any College or Seminary for the education exclusively of persons professing the Romish religion was absolutely forbidden. In consequence of this, the young men intended for the office of the priesthood in the Church of Rome, were obliged to repair to foreign countries for their education ; and as appears from a memorial presented to the Earl of Westmoreland, the then Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, at that time there were four hundred students, principally young Irishmen, in course of educational training for the ministry of the Romish Church, in the Colleges of France alone, a considerable number of whom were intended for Ireland. As a consequence of the Revolution, those Colleges or Seminaries were destroyed or broken up, and their property confiscated. The result was that the memorial referred to, dated the 14th of April, 1794, was presented to the Government by the Prelates of the Church of Rome, and signed on their behalf by Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin.

As considerable diversity of opinion exists relative to the several points referred to in the memorial, it may be satisfactory, as the ground-work of observation, to give it here at length :—

“The humble Memorial of the Prelates of the Roman Catholic Communion in Ireland, praying to erect Seminaries for the Education of Ecclesiastics, presented to John Earl of Westmoreland, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, January 14th, 1794.

After the usual introductory observations, it proceeds to say,
 “ Under the laws which formerly existed, your Excellency’s Memorialists were obliged to resort to foreign countries for education, particularly, to the kingdom of France, where they had procured many valuable establishments ; four hundred persons were constantly maintained and educated therein, for the ministry in the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland. In the anarchy which at present afflicts that kingdom, these establishments have been necessarily destroyed ; and even, although lawful authority should be restored, Memorialists conceive the loss to be irreparable ; for the revenue would not easily be recovered, and as the profligate principles of rebellion and atheism, propagated by the faction which now rules that kingdom, may not be speedily effaced, they would not expose youth to the contagion of sedition and infidelity, nor their country to the danger of thus introducing the pernicious maxims of a licentious philosophy. Memorialists, therefore, are apprehensive that it may be found difficult to supply the ministry of the Roman Catholic church in Ireland with proper clergymen, unless seminaries, schools, or academies be instituted, for educating the youth destined to receive holy orders according to the discipline of their own church, and under ecclesiastical superiors of their own communion ; and they beg leave further to represent, with all due respect and deference, to your Excellency’s wisdom, THAT SAID INSTITUTION WOULD PROVE OF ADVANTAGE TO THE NATION AT LARGE,

and be a matter of great indulgence to his Majesty's subjects professing the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland.

“Whilst sentiments unfavourable to the members of their communion prevailed, your Excellency's Memorialists were discouraged from seeking the means of education in their native country; but, conceiving that the demeanour of the Roman Catholics has removed such ill opinion, they humbly hope, that the moral instruction of a people who have been legally authorised to acquire landed property in this kingdom, and upon whom many other valuable privileges have been conferred under your Excellency's administration and auspices, may appear to his Majesty's ministers a subject not unworthy of his royal consideration and bounty. Your Excellency's Memorialists are confirmed in this hope, by the opinion often and publicly expressed by respectable individuals of their Protestant fellow-subjects, that it would conduce to the public good to educate the Irish Ecclesiastics of the Roman Catholic religion within his Majesty's dominions.

“Your Excellency's Memorialists also beg leave humbly to represent, that although the mode of education practised in the University of Dublin, may be well adapted to form men for the various departments of public business, yet it is not alike applicable to the ecclesiastics of a very ritual religion, and by no means calculated to impress upon the mind those habits of austere discipline, so indispensable in the character of a Roman Catholic clergyman, that without them **HE MIGHT BECOME A VERY DANGEROUS MEMBER OF SOCIETY.**

“That a distinct place of education is also necessary, because the regulations of the Roman Catholic church enjoin, that candidates for holy orders shall be proficient in certain branches of learning, which are not included in the exercises of the University of Dublin.

“That even where the Roman Catholic is the established religion, candidates for holy orders are obliged to receive the most important part of their education in seminaries distinct from the public universities.

“ That many persons who destine themselves to the ministry of the Roman Catholic religion in Ireland, are not sufficiently opulent to bear the expense of education in the University of Dublin, and of constant residence in the Metropolis; it is therefore the more necessary to provide literary instruction for them on more easy conditions; and although the liberality of the present heads of the University might induce them to receive persons on the foundation, yet neither could a sufficient number be thus accommodated, nor would it prove grateful to the feelings of the parties, and many other inconveniencies might arise, if young men should observe great temporal advantages conferred upon their fellow-students, whilst they were restricted to the humble walk of a subordinate ministry.

“ From these considerations, and conceiving that PIETY, LEARNING, AND SUBORDINATION WOULD BE THEREBY ESSENTIALLY PROMOTED, your Excellency’s Memorialists are induced to undertake the establishment of proper places for the education of the clerical youth of their communion. Being advised by counsel, that his Majesty’s royal license is necessary, in order legally to secure the funds which they may appropriate for that purpose, they humbly beg leave to solicit your Excellency’s recommendation to our Most Gracious Sovereign, that he will be pleased to grant his royal license for the endowment of academies or seminaries, for educating and preparing young persons to discharge the duties of Roman Catholic clergyman in the kingdom, under ecclesiastical superiors of their own communion.

“ JOHN THOMAS TROY,
R.C.A.B. of Dublin.

“ For myself, and on behalf of the Prelates of the

“ Roman Catholic communion in Ireland.

“ January 14th, 1794.”

It would appear that the Government of the day, with Mr. Pitt at its head, fully responded to the sentiments expressed in the memorial—which, it

should be observed, merely requested that the Roman Catholics themselves might have liberty to establish and endow Schools or Academies for the clerical education of persons professing the Roman Catholic religion ; and that the trustees might have power to raise subscriptions for the purpose.

Accordingly, an act was passed in the Irish Parliament, permitting the erection of a building at Maynooth, as an institution for the education of the Romish youth of the country, intended for the Romish priesthood—

In the I. II. and III. Section of the Act referred to (Geo. III. cap. 35,) the requisite number of Trustees are appointed, for the purpose of “establishing, endowing, and maintaining one Academy, for the education *only* of persons professing the Roman Catholic Religion,”—and it is declared that the said Trustees shall have full power and authority to receive Subscriptions and Donations to enable them to educate such persons, and to purchase and acquire lands not exceeding the value of £1000.

The IV. Section enacts that the Bye-Laws, *not affecting religious discipline*, shall be laid before the Lord Lieutenant.

The V. Section enacts, that the Trustees, or any seven of them, shall have the superintendence and visitorial power over said Academy.

The IX. Section requires that no Protestant, or Son of a Protestant, shall be admitted into the Institution.

The X. and XI. that a sum not exceeding £8000 may be paid to the Trustees towards establishing the said Academy.*

In the year following, the foundation stone of the Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth,† was laid by Earl Camden.

* See 35 Geo. III. c. 21.

† Maynooth is a small town, about eleven miles from Dublin, adjoining the residence of the Duke of Leinster. At this place, a house for the intended College was purchased for the sum of £4012 10s. ; and 54 acres

By thus at once meeting the wishes of the Romish Prelates, the British Government hoped to secure, (as they were assured by them would be the case) not only the undivided allegiance of those intended for the priesthood in this country, but also their good will and affection. How lamentably all these expectations have been frustrated and blasted by the outrageous, overbearing conduct of the individuals who have been educated in it from that day to the present, the history of Maynooth and its students, affords melancholy though convincing testimony.

But in order more perfectly to understand the actual facts of the case, it may here be necessary to go a little more minutely into the question connected with the original establishment of the Institution. It cannot be denied that the dread of the introduction into this country of antimonarchical and democratic principles, by the young men educated in France, was the ostensible motive which induced the Government to accede to the proposition made by the Romish Priests. Aware of the effects which had been produced throughout France, and over many portions of the Continent, by the diffusion of the licentious, infidel principles of the schools of French philosophy which pre-

of land were granted by his Grace the late Duke, on a lease of lives renewable for ever, at the annual rent of £74. Twenty acres of land were afterwards obtained from Mr. Stroyte, at an annual rent of £140. More land has since been added. Fifty students were admitted in 1795; fifty more in 1800; and in 1802, they amounted to 200, and in 1809, to 250. There are at present 500 Students in the Institution. In 1826, nearly £42,000 had been laid out on the building; very large additions have since been made to it.

vailed at that period ; and desirous, as far as possible, to save the people of Ireland, from the contagion of that flood of sedition and immorality, which had spread itself so widely over other lands—breaking down every barrier of civilized and social life—the Government at once acceded to the prayer of the memorial, hoping, as we have observed, by their ready display of kindness and attention to the wishes of the Romish Prelates, and by the superior education which would be given to young men intended for the Romish priesthood in Maynooth, to foster in their minds a love of order and of British laws, and even of the British Government ; but it is now equally certain from facts and circumstances which have, from time to time, come to light, that the entire plan of the Maynooth Seminary was concocted in the Vatican, and that the British Minister was cajoled into giving his consent and assistance to the project, by misrepresentations of facts and false statements artfully placed before him by the emissaries of Rome, at that time in this country.

No doubt the arguments in favour of the proposition were very specious, and many circumstances occurred at the time to render it scarcely possible for Mr. Pitt to refuse his assent. Having had occasion about that period to apply to the Court of Rome for supplies to be furnished to the British fleet and many thousands of our troops stationed in the Mediterranean, sent there to act against the French Directory, who at that time had proscribed Popery and

Christianity in general—and the application having been promptly acceded to, and the necessary supplies furnished—through the medium of Sir John C. Hippisley, then in Rome, a correspondence of great cordiality ensued between the Pope and the British Government. In a letter from Cardinal Zelada, Secretary to the Pope, in reference to granting the supplies required, he observes:—

“These positive proofs of a friendly correspondence, in which his Holiness will persevere to the utmost of his power, will undoubtedly obtain on the part of his Majesty, of your Excellency, and of your colleagues in the Government, a continuance of favourable and reciprocal acts in advancement of the interests of the two courts and of both countries.”

And again, in a letter from Cardinal Antonelli, Prefect of the College of the Propaganda Fide, dated February, 1795, and addressed to the Prelates of Great Britain and Ireland, by order of Pope Pius VI. in reference to the British Monarch, the Cardinal is desired to say:—

“In our persuasion, if the whole body of Catholics, in every part of that flourishing empire, would make it their object to contend with one another in establishing new and daily proofs of allegiance and obedience to so kind a sovereign, they might well expect from his royal bounty future progressive favours.”

A letter was at the same time addressed, by order of the Pope, to the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland, calling upon them to admonish their flocks, and to endeavour to dissuade them from those unlawful assemblages which were held at that time in various parts of the country.

In order more effectually to ensure the success of

their wishes, the Roman Catholic Priests and Prelates in Ireland also made a shew of the best feelings towards his Majesty and the English Government, in numerous addresses breathing sentiments of most devoted loyalty. In one address presented in 1794, signed by Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and eight other Bishops, in reference to the state of France at that period, they say—

“We look towards that unhappy nation, which is the object of hostility, and acknowledge with humble thanksgiving, the goodness of Divine Providence, which under the *best of constitutions*, has bestowed, on the land we live in, freedom exempt from anarchy, protection guarded against oppression, and a prince calculated by his wisdom and virtue, to improve that happy condition of society.”

So far was this semblance of good feeling to the British Government carried, that more than one individual nominated by the King of England to a particular bishopric in the Romish Church was at once appointed by the Pope—among others, the Roman Catholic Bishop of St. Domingo.

A slight glance over the history of the period referred to will at once explain the reason for such extra official courtesies—the Pope himself had a short time before been put down by the republican party in France—and thrones and monarchies were trembling before the power which was at the moment in the ascendant. From England the Pope had received considerable assistance, and to England, as a monarchical power, he looked with confidence for support in any future emergency ; while

at the same time, the Priests of England and Ireland were endeavouring to obtain one favour after another for themselves. The same apparent good feeling was evinced during the life of Pius VI. and was continued until his successor had crowned Bonaparte Emperor of the French.—From that moment, however, their tactics were altered, and their real hatred to Protestant England was again openly shewn in every way it could possibly be manifested. So much so, indeed, as to lead them in the most barefaced manner to express their best wishes for the success of the very man who had sent their Pope into exile. Their anxiety evidently was that by the successes of the French, Ireland should be for ever separated from Great Britain ; and become the ally of the Pope—and, as the rebellion proved, to effect this they gave to France their best assistance. Indeed, it has since been discovered from the Life of Wolfe Tone, published by his son, as well as from the reports of the Secret Committees of the Lords and Commons, that at the very moment the Priests and Prelates of Rome were forwarding the most loyal addresses to his Majesty and the Government, most of them were members of the Committee which organized the rebellion of 1798, and were carrying on a secret correspondence with parties in France to subvert what they termed “the tyranny of England, to establish the independence of Ireland, and to procure a free republic”—in fact they were at the moment endeavouring, if possible, to effect the overthrow of Great Britain.

Under the various circumstances of the country and the times, however, by many it is not considered surprising that Mr. Pitt should have taken a favourable view of the case as presented by the Romish Prelates, though, as experience has since demonstrated, his calculations and resolves were based upon false representations, which it is now evident were placed before him, for the purpose of inducing him to fall in with the plans they were anxious to carry forward. The establishment of Maynooth had been recommended to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland by the Duke of Portland while he was Secretary for Foreign Affairs ; besides which, it is said, that to the influence and arguments of Mr. Fox and Mr. Burke, the British public are indebted for the carrying out of the measure—that Mr. Pitt was forced to grant it against his judgment and inclination. Be this as it may, however, one thing is certain, that in this instance, as in every other case of truckling to the Pope of Rome, the result has been that the curse of heaven has rested on the transaction, and Maynooth has from that time to the present proved one of the greatest difficulties with which British Statesmen have had to contend.

In order professedly to enable him to come to a right understanding of the real tenets of the Romish religion, and to see how far he might go in repealing the penal statutes against Roman Catholics, Mr. Pitt, in the year 1788, had submitted the three following queries, drawn up by a Roman Catholic

barrister, to the heads of six Foreign Universities : —

“ 1. Has the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, any civil authority, power, jurisdiction, or pre-eminence whatsoever within the realm of England ?

“ 2. Can the Pope or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, absolve or dispense with his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance, upon any pretext whatsoever ?

“ 3. Is there any principle in the tenets of the Catholic faith by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or other persons differing from them in religious opinions in any transaction either of a public or private nature ?”*

To each of these queries, as might naturally be expected, from each and all of the Universities referred to, the British Minister received a direct and unqualified negative, The following is a correct synopsis of their replies—

“ 1. That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome, has not any civil authority, power, jurisdiction or pre-eminence whatever, within the realm of England.

“ 2. That the Pope, or Cardinals, or any body of men, or any individual of the Church of Rome *cannot* absolve or dispense his Majesty's subjects from their oath of allegiance upon any pretext whatever.

“ 3. That there is no principle in the Catholic faith, by which Catholics are justified in not keeping faith with heretics, or persons differing from them in religious opinions, whether of a public or a private nature.”

On these replies the Prime Minister based the

* The Questions were proposed in Latin, and the Answers were transmitted in the same language.

weight of his arguments in admitting the Romish claims. That no system of acting or reasoning could have been more futile, or more unworthy the mind of such a man as Mr. Pitt, must on calm reflection be admitted by his most ardent supporters. The fatuity of a British Cabinet Minister, of the Protestant faith, asking the heads of Popish Universities, whether their system was one of hypocrisy and fraud, and admitting that he believed them when they said "*it is not*"—does indeed appear beyond the comprehension of Protestants to credit. In fact he must have known well the answers were not *bona fide*. With the history of the persecution of Protestants in France—and the perfidy at all times of the Romanists, priests and laymen, to their Protestant brethren in the various cities and towns of that nation, he was well acquainted. He could not but have remembered that before the expulsion of Protestants from that country up to the period at which Louis XIV. sanctioned the horrible massacre of those who made a profession of the Protestant faith, that country was prosperous and triumphant—one of the greatest nations on the face of the globe—that in consequence of the industry, morality, and perseverance of the Protestants, commerce and manufactures flourished; but from the time the Protestants were expelled, France continued year after year to retrograde, until it reached its lowest point at the period of the Revolution, when the best blood of the Roman Catholic aristocracy of France deluged the very spots on which

the blood of the Protestant martyrs had been shed. He knew well, that on the other hand, from the moment the Protestant exiles of France set foot on British ground, bringing with them their industrious habits and various manufactures, Great Britain prospered and rose in wealth and power; the same thing took place in Holland, into which a considerable number of the Protestant exiles retired. He knew well from the page of history, that whatever Romanists might at any time profess, they never had kept faith with heretics; but, whenever they had the power mercilessly butchered them in cold blood—and yet with all these reminiscences staring him in the face, Mr. Pitt, in order to enable him to carry out some political measures which at that time he considered necessary—pretended to believe the answers returned from the universities—acceded to the request of the Romish Prelates; and thus established an institution calculated to perpetuate and propagate Popery with all its evils throughout Great Britain and Ireland.

That he was at the time fully aware that two of the universities referred to had on former occasions given opinions directly the reverse of what they then stated there can scarcely be a doubt. On the issuing of the Bull by Pope Clement VIII. against Queen Elizabeth, the Universities of Salamanca and Valladolid both decreed, “That since the Earl of Tyrone had undertaken the war against the Queen for the sake of religion, and with the Pope’s approbation, it was

as meritorious to aid him against the heretics, as to fight against the Turks, and that it was a mortal sin to aid the heretics in any way against him, and that those who did so could neither have absolution nor salvation." Also, that the University of Alcalá, on the ground that faith was not to be kept with heretics, and that it was lawful to extirpate them, defended the conduct of the Council of Constance, in consigning John Huss to the flames, although he had at the time of his arrest the letter of the Emperor Sigismund, granting him safe conduct to the place to which he was travelling. The reason assigned being, that inasmuch as the civil power was subordinate to the church, the letter of the Emperor was null and void.

But Mr. Pitt need not have looked to foreign countries to be informed what the tenets of the Romish religion really are.

In the Declaration and Protest of the Roman Catholics of England in 1789, the doctrine of their church is thus stated—

"If by the words interfering and opposing, is understood interfering by the spiritual right of preaching and teaching, it is unquestionably true, that the Church has a right to interfere with the civil independence, the civil sovereignty, the civil constitution, and the civil Government of this realm."

The Rev. Charles Plowden, a Romish priest, residing at Bristol, in a Tract published in London in 1790, "On the Modern Infallibility of the Pope," stated distinctly that "the General Councils are infallible, and that all Roman Catholics must implicitly adhere to them"—while Mr. Francis Plow-

den, the Roman Catholic historian, and one of their staunchest advocates, in his "Case Stated," published in London, in the year 1791, reiterated the assertion, affirming such to be actually the fact; the entire being authenticated by Dr. Milner, the Romish Vicar Apostolic, in p. 97 of his Ecclesiastical Democracy, also published in London, in 1793; in this he tells his readers that the "Fourth Lateran Council is called the Great Council." In addition to all these authorities, absolutely contradicting the negative of the Professors of the six Universities, to which Mr. Pitt wrote for information, as to the real tenets of the Church of Rome, there was also the celebrated pastoral of the Rev. Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, published in 1793, in which the same views are distinctly set forth, and mention made in particular of the Fourth Lateran Council as being infallible; in this document he also stated distinctly, that "the religious opinions of Catholics being unchangeable, are applicable at all times:" and he further told the Irish people that they "were implicitly bound to adhere to the decrees of the General Councils of their church,"* these decrees being held by the most eminent divines as of equal authority with the Holy Scriptures; the following are his words—

"The Church is infallible in her doctrinal decisions and canons on all points of faith and morals; and all Catholics are obliged to adhere implicitly to all decrees and canons which the Church, assembled in General Council declares, and decrees, and which the Pope has affirmed."

* Pastoral Address to the People of Ireland, p. 31.

And again he tells his readers,

"It is the fundamental article of faith, that the Pope or Bishop of Rome, is successor to St. Peter, Prince of Apostles, and that in the See, he enjoys by divine right, a spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy, not only of honor and rank, but of real jurisdiction and authority in the universal Church." "Roman Catholics," he goes on to say, "conceive this point as clearly established in the Scriptures, and by the constant tradition of of the Fathers in every age, as it is by the express decrees of the General Councils,"

Indeed nothing could be more strongly put than the cases given at the time by Romish writers in England and Ireland; they all agree in the opinion that "nothing but the authority that has enacted can annul" any of the decrees or canons, and that "that power never having annulled the decrees referred to, all Roman Catholics are obliged implicitly to adhere to them."* Mr. F. Plowden, to whom we have alluded, expressly averred, that "if any one asserts that the modern Catholics who are the

* The following extracts from a few of the decrees referred to will afford a fair idea of the general bearing of the entire, as regards heretics or Protestants; and which, if the Church of Rome should ever regain her power in these lands, would certainly be enforced.

"Bishops are empowered to try and condemn Protestants in their respective dioceses; and after the sentence pronounced against them, the mayor, sheriffs, or other officers, who must be present at the execution, are required to take them into their custody, and burn them in some public place."*

"If, after the death of those who, having once abjured heresy, they shall be found to have relapsed, their bodies shall be dug up, and their bones burnt."†

"The temporal lords shall, by the diocesan and inquisitors, be compelled by ecclesiastical censures to dig up the bodies of those who, having abjured heresy, shall have relapsed."‡

"If any person whom the archbishop, bishops, and inquisitors, suspect to be guilty of *Protestantism*, will not undergo canonical purgation,

* Concil. Alb. Can. 27, page 728.

† Concil. Alb. Can. 52, page 727.

‡ Concil. tom. xi, part 2, page 210.

object of the late bounty of Parliament, differ in one iota from their ancestors, he either deceives himself or wishes to deceive others. *Semper eadem* is more emphatically descriptive of our religion than of our jurisprudence.”*

From the foregoing, it will be seen that whatever other excuses may be made for Mr. Pitt, it cannot be said that he acted in ignorance.

or, by a damnable obstinacy, refuse to swear for the purpose of his purgation, he is to be condemned as a *Protestant*!†

“*Protestants* shall not be admitted to give testimony as a witness, or to any public offices, or to the elections of those that belong to them. They shall have no power to make a will, or succeed to any inheritance. No man shall be compelled to answer them in any suit, but they shall be compelled to answer others. If a *Protestant* be a judge, his sentence shall be null and void, nor shall any cause come before him. If an advocate, he shall not be permitted to plead. If a clerk or notary, the instrument drawn by him shall be of no moment.”‡

“If any bishop or archbishop shall be remiss in purging his diocese of heretical filth, he must be deposed from his episcopal office.”§

“The names of the accusers of *Protestants* shall not be made public, either by word or sign. This is the pleasure of the apostolic see.”§

“It would be blasphemy in any person to assert that the sentences, canons, and decrees of the General Councils were not dictated by the *Holy Ghost* !!!”||

“And whereas, in other countries, by the law of nations, notorious criminals, infamous and perjured persons, were not allowed to be admitted to give evidence or testimony against others, especially in matters of life or death, all criminals and infamous persons, though partaking with them in their crime, are to be admitted to accuse and testify against *Protestants* !!!”¶

“By the 3rd Canon of the fourth Lateran Council, ‘a full remission of sins, and eternal salvation, are granted to those who, under the badge of the cross, shall set about the extermination of heretics.’”**

“The punishments, which, by various general Councils, and the Canon Law, must be inflicted on heretics, are the following; ‘*excommunication*,’ ‘*confiscation of their goods*,’ ‘*imprisonment*,’ ‘*exile*,’ ‘*death*.’”††

Popish priests are bound by their canonical oath, to infuse the canons of the general Councils into their *parishioners*, or those who shall belong to them in their function.

* Concil. Later. Quartem, Can. 3, Concil. xi. p. 157.

† Concil. Later. Quartem. Can. 3.

‡ Concil. Later. Quartem, Can. 3.

§ Concil. tom. xi, apud Binium, page 689, 690.

|| Concil. Basil. apud Binium, tom. viii, page 128.

¶ Concil. tom. xi, apud Binium, page 689, 690.

** Concil. apud Binium: tom. viii, p. 149, 150. The Catholic Committee have acknowledged the validity of this dreadful Council, having quoted it in page 23, in their Statement of the Penal Laws, published by Fitzpatrick, 1812.

†† Concil. tom. xi. p. 668, apud Binium.

* See Plowden’s “Case stated,” p. 47, published in London, 1791.

Comparing these various statements with the experience of the last sixty years, it now appears evident that the Church of Rome had all along played a double game with the British Minister. Although she led him to believe the contrary, she had never rescinded one single law against Protestants or heretics. Indeed so far did she carry this system of dissimulation, that a small prayer book or manual was published in Dublin, in which various questions were put, and answers given, from which it would appear that the Romanists of the day repudiated the persecuting tenets of former ages, as well as their belief in the infallibility of the Pope, and the doctrine that faith was not to be kept with heretics ; and Sir Henry, (then Mr.) Parnell, to maintain his position in favour of the Romanists, read several extracts from it in his place in Parliament. At the very moment this was done, however, and while the most solemn engagements were entered into with our Protestant Government, a rescript* or authoritative letter was sent over from Rome by the Prefect of the Propa-

* That this document was sent over at the time Maynooth was first opened for students is not now denied, as several subsequent proceedings resulted from its adoption ; and to complete the matter, in the year 1808, "DENS' complete body of Theology," which is in fact a compendium of the *Secunda Secundæ* of Thomas Aquinas, was adopted, and an edition of Three Thousand copies, printed by Mr. Coyne of Capel-st. was published under the public sanction of the entire bench of Romish Prelates in Ireland—every one of them having signed the document authorising its publication. It was about the same time made the Conference book for the province of Leinster ; and in 1831, it had become the Conference book for all the dioceses in Ireland, and still remains so.

ganda, addressed to the four archbishops and seven bishops, as Trustees to Maynooth, directing them to prepare for the use of the priests and students in the seminary a code of morals and Theological Discipline selected from the works of St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, which contain ultra-montane principles, stating distinctly that every baptized man, woman, and child is bound to obey the Pope, even in opposition to the commands of their lawful sovereign ; that any one not submitting to this rule must be considered as a heretic and deserter from the Bishop of Rome, and be punished accordingly.

That Mr. Pitt was induced to admit the measures referred to in consequence of the various representations made to him from Rome, there can be little doubt—but that all his calculations were, as we have stated, based upon misconceptions, and the false statements of Romish Prelates, is now made apparent by the page of historic record. The “sayings and doings” of the very men who induced him to give up his principles, and to do and sanction acts diametrically opposed to the spirit and genius of the British Constitution, go directly to demonstrate that the entire transaction between the Premier and the Prelates was based on fraud and perjury. It must be confessed, however, that to any one who will now look calmly on the page of history recording the transactions of the period referred to, it will appear evident that both parties were playing a deep and desperate game.

Rome had a purpose to serve, and her Professors

had few qualms of conscience as to the unrighteousness of the way in which she should accomplish it. The English and Irish priests in France, in the course of the French Revolution, had lost not only all the property which they had in the various Colleges in that country, but were themselves driven from it, with little hope of being allowed to go back ; and in the spirit which has ever characterized the followers of Rome, the Jesuits endeavoured to turn the spread of revolutionary principles to their own account, and unfortunately succeeded but too well in their efforts. From the state of public opinion and public feeling, not only in France and in various parts of the Continent, but in Great Britain, with regard to the Romish religion, the Romish Prelates were at that moment trembling for their own safety. Having seen the effects of the Revolution in France, they greatly feared lest the contagion of these excesses should spread into Ireland, and they themselves might be the sufferers ; and therefore determined if possible to strengthen their interests in that country, by the establishment of a seminary in which the priests could be trained for the future support of the Papacy, according to their own wishes and dictates, and independent of the better classes of the people ; and as we have said, they artfully took advantage of the peculiar state of affairs in France and elsewhere to obtain their object. They well-knew that the answers received by Mr. Pitt from the Universities were mere deceptions, inasmuch as they were opposed to the funda-

mental principles and doctrines of the Romish Church, and that although ostensibly sent from the Professors in the Universities, had been framed by the Conclave at Rome to meet the emergency of the moment—they, nevertheless, put forward their case in so specious a way as to work on the better judgment of the Premier, and by inducing him to believe they were sincere in their professions of loyalty and attachment to the British Crown, prevailed upon him to sanction the plan and scheme they themselves had laid down—his dread of the introduction of revolutionary and antimonarchical principles into the country, and the necessity which at the moment existed of keeping on good terms with the Pope, appear to have blinded him to the snare laid for him, as well as to the evil results which must necessarily ensue from granting the required measure. They represented to him that it was to prevent an evil influence being exerted by foreign students on the people of Ireland, they wished to be allowed to erect Colleges for themselves in the country. He took the bait, and they, acting on the principle since carried out by Mr. O'Connell, of taking whatever they could get by way of instalment, from year to year petitioned for one thing after another, until they finally succeeded in placing the institution of Maynooth on the funds of the country as a Government Establishment. They had in 1788 obtained the right to possess freehold property ; in 1793 they were granted the elective franchise, free from any peculiar restrictions ; and getting on by degrees,

they obtained what they required with regard to Maynooth College.

Here it may be necessary to remark that although by the priests and prelates the establishment of this institution was strongly advocated and supported, petitions were sent in from a numerous portion of the more respectable classes of Roman Catholics, against it. The following is an extract :—

“A Petition of his Majesty’s Catholic Subjects of Ireland, whose names are thereunto subscribed, on behalf of themselves and others.”

“That the Petitioners having, in common with the rest of their brethren, the Catholics of Ireland, received as one of the most important and acceptable benefits bestowed on them by his Majesty and the legislature, the permission of having their youth educated along with the Protestant youth of the kingdom, in the University of Dublin; and experience having demonstrated the wisdom and utility of that permission, Petitioners see with deep concern the principle of separation and exclusion, then as they hoped for ever set aside, now likely to be revived and re-enacted.”

“That the exclusion of persons professing the Protestant religion, or whose fathers professed the Protestant religion, appears to the Petitioners to be highly inexpedient, inasmuch as it tends to perpetuate that line of separation between his Majesty’s subjects of different religions, which the Petitioners do humbly conceive it is the interest of the country to obliterate, and the Petitioners submit, that if the youth of both religions, were instructed together in those branches of classical education, with an examination for all, their peculiar tenets, would in all probability, be no hindrance at length to a friendly and liberal intercourse through life.”

In the petition it is further observed, that “it might in future be converted into a corrupt and

ruinous system of advancing private interests and supporting local connections."

Writing on this particular subject, in the year 1805, Mr. Theobald M'Kenna, a respectable Roman Catholic Barrister, observed:—

"It is certain, that no man will think of paying for his son, if it be held out, that persons who offer for the church are to be educated gratis; neither will persons, who can afford to pay, destine their children for that condition, if they perceive that men of no peculiar recommendation are brought up free of expense, and start with equal advantage. One of the principles I endeavour to impress, is, that Catholics of circumstance should be led to give their sons to the church."

From the foregoing it is apparent many of the Roman Catholic gentry opposed the establishment of Maynooth, as a seminary in which young men intended for the priesthood, would be educated gratis, at the public expense. It also appears that during subsequent debates on the question in Parliament, several members objected to the grant on similar grounds; Mr. Percival and others, saying, that it would prevent the sons of gentlemen being sent to Trinity College. Mr. Grattan expressing his most ardent desire, that Roman Catholics and Protestants should be educated together in Trinity College; and Mr. Wyse stated his conviction that if Trinity College were opened up to the Roman Catholic youth, there would be a sufficient ground for discontinuing the grant.

At this particular point, it may be well also to observe, that one great cause of the universal vulgarity and bigotry of the Romish priests educated

in Maynooth, is and was this very "Government Grant." In consequence of this the Institution was and is regarded by the more respectable class of Roman Catholics, somewhat in the light of a "poor school," and consequently the better order of Irish people will not allow their sons to be educated in it. With all their fondness for mother church, they do not like the idea of their children being placed on a level with the sons of the low-bred ignorant cottiers, whose parents, squatting on their property, have nothing else to recommend them but their bigotry and devotion to the church of Rome. Many of them, formerly, by means of the hedge schools, and now by the assistance of the National Board, together with the patronage of some uncle or cousin *priest*, who may have influence at Maynooth, are enabled to enter the institution, from which, if they had to pay one half what it costs the humblest lad entering Trinity College, they would be for ever excluded. And we conceive a stronger argument than this could be scarcely brought forward against the continuance of the Grant, inasmuch as were such persons not admitted, their places would be filled up by young persons of a more respectable grade. The sons of wealthy shopkeepers, and of the better class of farmers, who could pay for their education, and maintain them while in college, would then be educated for the priesthood. This was the case when the young men intended for priests were sent to the colleges on the Continent, and would

have been the case still if the Grant to Maynooth had never been made.*

There is now no question, that even at that early period the Pope and the Cardinals were anxious to rear a body of priests independent of the more respectable portion of the people, over whom His Holiness could preserve the most absolute control. The ultimate object which the Pope and his Prelates had in view was evidently to accumulate power in the hands of the priests—not only spiritual but temporal—to be used for the benefit of the church and the church's head, whenever occasion might require it.

And here also it may be noticed, that the conduct and character of the Romish priests who have been educated in Maynooth, form a striking contrast as compared with those educated abroad; indeed in most respects the comparison is disadvantageous.

Bad as the old Irish priest, educated in France or even in Italy, may have been, with all his natural and acquired antipathies to Protestant principles and Protestant institutions, still there was something of the gentleman about him, which led him in his private associations to lay by his bitterness of feeling, and to live on good terms with his Protestant neighbours; the lessons which he had learned in the schools of French philosophy, how-

* By a return made to the House of Commons, it appeared that out of 205 students entering Maynooth, 92 were above 20 years of age; and that while 148 were returned as the sons of farmers, *alias* cottiers, there was not even one said to be the son of a gentleman.

ever undesirable in other points of view, had taught him to give up much of that rancour and intolerance which the Irish teachers of superstition and bigotry would have led him to adopt towards those differing from him. Many of them were men of general information—sons of respectable farmers, and even of the gentry—they had seen something of the world, and had learned something of the usages of good society—which the Irish priests of the present day educated in Maynooth, low born, and lowly bred* have no opportunity of becoming acquainted with. Drinking in hatred to every thing that is Protestant—it might almost be said with his mother's milk—and taught in infancy and earliest youth, to look upon Protestants as his natural enemies—and as he rises into manhood, ignorant of the world and the usages of respectable society—instructed in the hedge school or Roman Catholic *National* School, he enters the Seminary a fit subject for the tuition he

* See Dr. Doyle's and Mr. O'Connell's description of them in Report of Parliamentary Commission for Maynooth.

The Roman Catholics of Ireland at the time referred to, are thus described by one well acquainted with their character—

"The majority of the inhabitants of Ireland, when computed by the poll, are Papists, in the strictest sense of the word; they are about three-fifth parts of the inhabitants at large.

"This body entertains the most implacable rancour against what it deems and stiles heresy, that is, every religious doctrine, which differs in the smallest degree from the creed of the Romish church. Of all the inhabitants of Europe possessed by the Romish superstition, the Irish Romanists are eminently the most inflamed and infatuated bigots. Their religion teaches them intolerance in the severest degree; they are bound to exterminate and destroy all heretics, and to depose all heretical sovereigns, whenever they have it in their power so to do; they are therefore the irreconcilable enemies to every Protestant State upon earth, and particularly to Great Britain."

is to receive there—to become, as far as a system can make him, the slave of his bishop—the coadjutor of the demagogue, and the tyrant of the people. Taken from the lowest grade of society, whose feelings they inherit, and in whose illegal combinations many of them have taken a part—educated within the walls of Maynooth in democratic principles, and not a single effort being made during the period of their residence, to counteract the feelings of disaffection to the British Government, the consequence almost invariably is, that at the termination of their term of study, the students leave Maynooth in a frame of mind far better calculated and disposed to foment unpleasant feelings in reference to politics and religion than to allay them ; being themselves, in far the greater number of cases, rebels in politics, and bigots in religion. Indeed we have the testimony of Dr. Doyle in a letter signed with his own name, directed to the legislature of the country, that the men “sent out of Maynooth, and who have been educated at the public expense, are united but by slender ties to the Government, and necessarily hostile to the religion of the State.”

But by some it is still considered, that when the institution was at first established it was not by any means intended that it should be supported or assisted out of the public purse—that on the contrary the agreement was that the Romanists were merely to be allowed to support it out of their own funds, that at most it was only intended that the Govern-

ment should assist at the building of the institution. Even His Grace the Duke of Wellington, in debating the question in the year 1808, took this view of the subject.* His Grace, then Sir Arthur Wellesley, argued from the words of the Memorial presented by the Romish Bishops, which as has been seen from the document itself, merely prayed that they might be permitted to establish the institution “with their own funds.” That such would be the opinion of any one simply arguing from the document cannot be disputed; but it must also be remembered that in one of the sections of the act passed in reference to the memorial, it is distinctly stated that a sum of £8,000† shall be placed in the hands of the trustees for the object proposed.

In the Irish House of Lords, on the 5th of June 1795, the Lord Lieutenant in a speech to both Houses, observed :—“A wise foundation has been laid for educating at home the Roman Catholic clergy.” From these circumstances, and others which occurred at the same period, Dr. Troy and other Romanists have from time to time endeavoured to prove that the Government not only intended to erect suitable buildings for the institution, but to pay for its continued support out of the public

* See Hansard, v. xi. p. 122; also *Memoirs of Lord Castlereagh*, vol. 2.

† £10,000 was the sum voted in the miscellaneous returns. On the 28th April, Mr. Grattan took an opportunity of stating that the entire sum of £10,000, would not all be required for the purposes of the College, and that as it was for National Education he thought the balance ought to be applied to schools open for the instruction of persons of every religious denomination.

purse. That nothing could be more unfounded will appear evident from what actually occurred for several years from the date of the first Grant. In fact, the circumstance of their having annually presented a petition to Parliament for assistance, proves they did not consider the donation in the light of an endowment of the institution ; and that in this they were quite correct, is plainly demonstrated by the House of Lords having refused the Grant in 1799.

From entries in the journals of the Irish House of Commons, it appears that grants varying from £7000 to £10,000, were made 12th February, 1796, 27th January, 1797, and 20th February, 1798. That the various sums were to be applied to the building of the institution was subsequently insisted on in the House of Commons by various members, but there can be little doubt that the trustees availed themselves of the good feeling manifested to them by the Government, as well as of the carelessness of those who should have seen how the sums voted were applied, for it would appear that in a short time after the erection of Maynooth, in which none but persons intended for the Romish priesthood were to be trained, the private subscriptions were given to support the Royal College in Carlow, in which the laity were to be educated ; while good care was taken to support Maynooth altogether from the funds of the State.

On the 25th February, 1799, however, the usual petition from the trustees, having been presented,

together with an account of the expenditure, and a list of professors, teachers, and students; on a report of the Committee of Supply, laid before a Committee of the whole House, after some discussion, the following resolution was unanimously agreed to :—

RESOLVED—“ That it is the opinion of the Committee, that a sum of £6616 4s. 2d. (which with £1383 15s. 10d. balance in hands made £8000,) be granted to his Majesty, towards defraying the charge of the full establishment of the Roman Catholic Seminary for one year to the 25th day of February, 1800.”

On the 5th of April a message, agreeable to the foregoing, was brought up to the Lords, and read a first time; on the 6th an order was made for a report of the charge or expense of the full establishment at Maynooth; on the 11th it was ordered that an account of *the donations and subscriptions paid to the trustees*,* and an account of the number of persons who were at that time in the seminary, distinguishing such as were students from those who held situations, should be laid before the House; on the 12th the second reading was adjourned until the Monday following, and the Lords were specially summoned to attend; on the 15th a motion was made that the said Bill be committed to a Committee of the whole House on the 1st of August following; a debate arose upon the question; the

* Of these it appeared there were few, as they had been given to the Carlow College; and there can be little doubt this was one of the reasons why the House of Lords refused any grant to Maynooth in 1799.—Up to 1826, the donations and legacies to Maynooth, from the date of its erection, amounted to £4436 13s. 3d. while the public money expended on it was £390,714.

motion was resolved in the affirmative—twenty-five voting for it, and one against it—being tantamount to throwing out the Bill altogether*—the House of Lords thus plainly demonstrating, that they did not consider the institution, in consequence of any former proceedings, or former grants, as having been endowed by the State, or that the House was pledged to vote, even in annual grants, any sum or sums for its maintainance or support. From the entire proceedings it is also evident that the resolution was not come to in a hurried or inconsiderate way. The fullest information relative to the institution had been obtained; the Lords had been specially summoned for the day on which the subject was to be debated; and it would appear, that after the most mature deliberation, the House came to the very important resolution we have stated. Surely nothing could more distinctly mark their feelings upon the question. It was the last year of the Irish Parliament, and immediately after the rebellion of 1798, in which so many of the Romish priests took a very prominent part; and, as if distinctly to place their opinion on record, the Irish House of Lords, by an extraordinary majority of twenty-five to one, refused to vote a single shilling for the purpose of educating the priests of Rome in Ireland.

* See Report of Lords, 15th April, 1792.

Having, in the foregoing brief analysis, endeavoured to shew the purposes for which the Grant to Maynooth was originally made, and having also, as faithfully as we could, placed before the reader the circumstances and conditions under which it was given, we now come to inquire more particularly into the second question proposed—"Was it right or judicious, or in accordance with the great principles of the British Constitution, to make a grant of the public money for the establishment of such an institution?"

It will have been noticed, that, as we passed along, we endeavoured to demonstrate, not only the inconsistency, but the folly and fatuity of a Protestant Government in any way assisting the avowed agents of the Pope, in their endeavours to establish and perpetuate his authority in Great Britain, by founding a seminary for the education of young men, of mean origin, in the principles and practices of the Romish religion—more especially as it had been clearly ascertained that wherever such persons had gained a footing, acting as his vassals and instruments, they invariably introduced or perpetuated, anarchy, hatred, and ill-will, amongst the inhabitants, by their endeavours to upset the Protestant institutions of the land. That Mr. Pitt was grossly deceived, by the Priests and Prelates of Rome, in the statements laid before him having reference to the College, we have also shewn distinctly; for while it was *their* wish to establish such an institution, in order to promote the interests of *the fraternity*,

and of the Roman Pontiff, the more respectable classes of the people of Ireland were by no means favourable to the measure. We also expressed our opinion that had Mr. Pitt listened to the voice of history,* or attended to the warnings given him by the best friends of Great Britain and Ireland; nay more, that had he even, in place of sending to

* The voice of history would have taught him, by example, that it was perfect madness to give any assistance to Popery. It would have informed him that from 1560 to 1593 there were murdered in France, simply because they were Protestants, 39 princes, 382 noblemen, 147,518 gentlemen, and 760,000 of the common people—and not to refer more particularly to the deeds of horror perpetrated in Ireland—that in November, 1641, 200,000 English Protestants were massacred in cold blood, “with a degree of barbarity unequalled in any other nation, and at which credulity is startled”—that by the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, 1685, one-twentieth of the whole body of Protestants in France were barbarously murdered—800,000 having made their escape into foreign lands.—See Russell’s *Mod. Eur.* v. iii. p. 289.

Need we, as a further proof of our position, refer to the fact that during the insurrections in England in the reign of Elizabeth, Pius V. addressed a letter to the people of the district, telling them “to persevere in the work, not doubting but that God would grant them assistance; and that if they should die in asserting the Catholic faith, and the authority of the see of Rome, it were better for them, with the advantage of a glorious death, to purchase eternal life, than by ignominiously living, with the loss of their souls, shamefully to obey the will of an ungovernable woman.”—Pii. V. *Epist.* p. 290. That in the 13th year of her reign, Clement VIII. fulminated the Bull of Excommunication, declaring her to be a heretic, and the favourer of heretics. “We declare her,” said he, “to be deprived of her pretended title to the kingdom aforesaid, and of all dominion, dignity, and privilege whatsoever; and also the nobility, subjects and people of the said kingdoms, and all which have in any sort sworn unto her, to be for ever absolved from every such oath, and all manner of duty, of dominion, of allegiance, and obedience. We also command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, and people, aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her, or her monitions, mandates, and laws, and those which shall do to the contrary we do likewise anathematise.” Elizabeth, annoyed by this insolence, procured an act, declaring it to be high treason to affirm that the Queen was not a

foreign universities, consulted some of the Romish writers of that day in England,* on the subjects on which he required information, there could be little doubt he would never have placed the country in the anomalous and perilous situation of giving pecuniary support to a system which the King, Lords, and Commons had each and all sworn to be damnable and idolatrous, and which he himself knew to be a curse to any country.

In a speech delivered in the Irish House of Commons, in the year before the memorial relative to Maynooth was presented, the Right Hon. John Foster, Speaker of the House, in referring to the

lawful sovereign, or to bring bulls, indulgences, or absolutions from the Pope into Great Britain or Ireland.

The foregoing, taken in connection with the following extract from the 4th Council of Lateran, will shew what Protestants might expect should Popery by any dispensation of Providence, ever be permitted to have any power in these lands—"All heretics and schismatics, although they practice the Christian virtue of charity in its fullest extent; and although they shed their blood for Christ, yet they will most indubitably partake of eternal fire with the devil and his angels, unless before the end of this life, they shall be incorporated with, and reconciled to the Catholic Church; for neither baptism, or charity, however copious, or even martyrdom, can give any chance of salvation to any man, who does not hold the unity of the Catholic Church."—*See Fourth Con. Lat.*

That the worst persecution would be revived in this country were Popery again in power, is evident from what took place whenever the popes regained any power they had lost. In May, 1815, Pius VII. compelled the small congregation of Protestants which had collected in Rome to flee to Naples—he revived the order of the Jesuits to assist him—and again put in operation the infernal Inquisition. The more recent doings of the present Pope and his predecessor are too fresh in the memory of all to require particular notice. The case of the Madias furnish a practical comment of the manner in which heretics would be treated should they dare to read their Bibles.

* See pp. 16, 17, and 18.

acts of the English Minister relative to the Relief Bill, sounded the note of warning. He observed—

“He never blamed the Irish Government, nor did he blame them now; they could not act otherwise; the measure began in Britain, but he should never cease to think it was extreme folly, or indiscretion in the British Ministry, to rouse the question here.”

Again, addressing the members of the House—

“You are trustees for your constituents, they are Protestants, have you the power to destroy their rights, by overwhelming them without their consent: for his part he received his seat in the House, and the trust which he brought with it, from Protestants, under a Protestant king, a Protestant constitution, and a Protestant ascendancy, and by the blessing of God, he never would give up their rights till they should desire him.”

And again, in reference to the ultimate objects of the priests of Rome, he observed—

“His opinion remained unshaken—he was still more confirmed in it, by considering the circumstances of their clergy—their oath of ordination bound them not as our Monarch was bound, merely to maintain, but to *extend and promote* (pro posse, he believed was the phrase) the interests of their church. And all history concurred in proving their zeal; they have sent missionaries to propagate their religion at great expense, trouble, and hazard, to almost every part of the world—extension of its doctrines, and its powers, is the duty of its professors; their habits of life, too, urge them to it; they are bound to celibacy; strangers to all the comforts of domestic life, their passions find no resting place, their home had not the allurements of love and of content, to engage and occupy their mind. Human passions are ever alive; if love don't engage them, ambition will; the experience of ages, shews us the am-

bition of the Romish clergy, and when that ambition is fired by a religious zeal, and by the certain consequence of great temporal emolument and dignity, who can say to what extent it may go—their oath, their interest, and their ambition, all concur in rousing them to exert every power and watch every opportunity of effecting this change; and however unpleasant to advert to circumstances of which the authors seem to have repented, he cannot avoid, as it is so apposite to the argument, to notice how eagerly and early their prelates shewed their ambition, by claiming their titles of archbishops and bishops in their signatures to their petition the other day to this house, contrary to the existing laws; titles which they would not have presumed to have asserted, but from the influence of that ambitious zeal, which over-bore their judgment. They foresaw their own ascendancy so strongly in the very first dawn of Catholic power, that they actually believed themselves in the possession of it.”

And still further, in reference to the little amount of dependence that was to be placed on the oaths of the Romanists, he says—

“Nothing tends more to perjury than the want of knowledge of the nature of an oath; and their superiors had expressed their opinion as to the lower order of Catholics upon this point. In their petition to the throne, they had stated that *numbers of catholics preferring perjury to famine, submitted to oaths which they utterly disbelieved*. What were these oaths which they had utterly disbelieved? The oaths of *allegiance* and *supremacy*. Were these the men whose loyalty was so highly praised, and who were to be admitted into the legislature? and yet this is their character drawn by those who know them best. When their friends say they think so lightly of an oath, as to prefer perjury to famine, can you doubt they would take false

oaths, where the advancement of their religion was super-added to the avoidance of famine."

About the same period, Lord Clare, in his speech in the Irish House of Lords, in reference to the secret communication kept up between the disaffected Romanists in Ireland, and the revolutionists of France, gave it as his opinion that "the links of that communication were kept up by the Roman Catholic clergy—they are they who guide, govern, and direct the consciences and opinions of that very dissatisfied body of men, the Roman Catholics of Ireland."

In the same year also, the justly celebrated Dr. Duigenan, in a speech in the Commons, warned British Ministers not to allow themselves to be imposed on by misrepresentations—in reference to a petition forwarded to his Majesty George III. by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, he observed—

"Every page, and almost every line of which teems with misrepresentation or falsehood; and as the catholics have by this system of untruth, deception, and fraud, imposed so far on his majesty's ministers in England, as to procure a paragraph to be inserted in the speech from the throne, recommending in the king's name to our serious consideration the situation of his majesty's catholic subjects, and that we shall consider the same with liberality." [He goes on to say he would speak out the truth.] "In hopes that my voice, however weak, may reach the throne, and rouse the just indignation of our sovereign against a set of persons who have, by fraud and imposition, audaciously attempted to procure his countenance, to the unhinging and disjoining the whole frame of his Irish government; and uprooting foundations which have been laid by wise antiquity, and

supported and maintained by the sage policy of two centuries; and which have been strong enough to resist and repel the shocks of three general and most formidable rebellions of the catholic inhabitants of this kingdom, since the commencement of the reign of queen Elizabeth of most glorious memory."

After such repeated warnings, given by individuals living in Ireland, and well qualified to judge of the matters on which they spoke, and on whose judgment and prudence the British Minister should confidently have relied, it might almost be considered superfluous to press the question further, was it right or proper in Mr. Pitt to lend his countenance and support to the establishment of an institution, the object of which was to foster and increase a class of individuals against whom he had been so warned.

Not to go farther into these matters, however, for the present—but taking up the subject on the shewing of the priests and prelates themselves, that the object of the Grant was to establish a seminary in which students were to be trained up in the peculiar doctrines and dogmas of the Romish Church, freed from the contamination of the evil influences of foreign universities, we feel there was no one good or solid argument advanced to prove the propriety or necessity of the British Government assisting in such a measure.

As to the danger of educating young men for the priesthood in foreign universities, and the benefit that would ensue from a home education, we conceive that far too much stress was laid upon these

points. It must be perfectly evident to any one looking dispassionately at the matter, that the real danger to be apprehended, lay, not in the locality or place in which the colleges might be situated, but in the kind of instruction imparted to the students educated in them—it mattered little whether the seminary were situated in France or Ireland, if the principles of morality and religion inculcated by the teachers were such as would inevitably induce the bitterest feelings of hostility to the Protestant religion and Protestant institutions of Great Britain; and that the inculcation of the peculiar doctrines and dogmas of the Romish religion would have this effect, Mr. Pitt, or any other senator who knew what the tenets of Popery were, could not doubt for a moment.

It may be argued, however, that the surveillance under which Maynooth was placed by the British Government, was well calculated to obviate any evil resulting from the education which would be given to the students in the institution. But it has been made evident, by various commissions appointed by Parliament, that such was not the fact; for although at the first establishment of Maynooth, the Chancellor and the three principal Judges were named among the Trustees, *if they thought proper to attend their meetings*—still no one but a Roman Catholic was at liberty to interfere or inquire into *any matters connected with religion*—and it appears even this nominal guarantee or safeguard was removed in the last year of the Irish Parliament. In

consequence of a letter addressed by Edmond Burke to Dr. Hussey, a priest educated in Spain, and appointed the first President of Maynooth, an act was passed by Parliament removing the Protestants altogether from the Board of Trustees, and appointing them to be the "Visitors of the College," in conjunction with the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Earl of Fingal, and the Roman Catholic Archbishops of Dublin and Armagh; whose business it was to hold triennial visitations, if they thought proper to attend, at which, however, as before, none but the *Roman Catholic members* could take any part, in *matters concerning religion*. Indeed from the first this was the stipulated condition—as even such of the bye-laws of the institution as had *reference to religion* were not to be laid before the Lord Lieutenant; while at the same time "the rule of piety and domestic discipline" used in the institution, was a transcript of the laws of the Irish College at Rome. Had the original arrangement been allowed to stand, however, the case would have been little altered, as the parties named were by no means fitted for such an office; for instance, we would ask what benefit could possibly result to Protestants by the appointment to the office of visitors of Lord Chancellor Brady, Chief Justice Monaghan, Chief Baron Pigott and Judge Ball, especially if they were not permitted to inquire into any matters connected with the religious discipline of the institution; and this the priests never would allow, as with these matters no layman, even though he be

a Roman Catholic, has, according to their creed, any right to interfere. Of this Dr. Milner, the Romish advocate, gave the fullest assurance, emphatically declaring that the Romish Bishops possessed "the exclusive power of deciding in all matters relating to the faith and discipline of the Irish Church, and of the jurisdiction of which you might as well pretend to pluck a beam from the sun, as to touch one fibre."

Such being the case, and there being no way of interfering with the doctrines or principles taught in the institution, it must appear evident to any unprejudiced mind it should never have been established. Even on the principle of doing evil that good might ensue, had Mr. Pitt fairly examined the matter, he would have found he was doing wrong in expending a single shilling on such an institution—inasmuch as good could never be expected to ensue from the establishment of Popery.

But it may still be said, under the circumstances of the times, Mr. Pitt may have acted wisely in endeavouring to conciliate the feelings and affection of the Romish priests, and the Roman Catholic community, by establishing the college ; but even on this point he received timely warning—Sir John Foster, in the speech already alluded to, emphatically observed—

"Conciliation is dwelt on as a motive, but will the bill conciliate. You gave them much last year for conciliation, did they thank you? No ; they rose in their demands and passed you by ; it is not in the nature of any body of men who look to full participation of power, to rest satisfied with a

partial share, they never will be contented while any thing remains to be obtained."

But in this place, in order to do perfect justice to the subject, it may be necessary to enquire what is the creed, and what are the peculiar doctrines of the Romish Church as taught in Maynooth. Not to occupy space with unimportant details, we give the following extracts, taken verbatim from "the Creed as established by the authority of the Council of Trent"—

"I profess that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the New Law, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, and necessary, though not all to every one, for the salvation of mankind, that is to say, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Marriage, and that they confer grace. And that of these, Baptism, Confirmation, and Orders cannot be repeated without sacrilege.

"I profess in like manner, that in the Mass, is offered unto God a true, proper and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there is really, truly, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ: and that a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood; which conversion the Catholic Church calls 'Transubstantiation.'

"I confess also, under one kind alone the whole and entire Christ and the true sacrament to be received.

"I firmly hold that there is a Purgatory, and the souls therein detained are assisted by the prayers of the faithful.

"So also, that the saints reigning together with Christ, are to be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated.

"I most firmly declare that images of Christ and of the ever-Virgin Mother of God, and also of other saints, are to be had and retained, and that to them due honour and veneration is to be paid.

"Also that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in his Church; and that the use of them is highly salutary to a Christian people, I affirm.

"The Holy Catholic and Apostolic Roman Church, I acknowledge to be the mother and mistress of all churches; and to the *Roman Pontiff*, successor of the blessed Prince of the Apostles, Peter, and vicar of Jesus Christ, *I promise and swear true obedience.*

“ All other things also by the sacred canons and œcumenical councils, and especially by the holy council of Trent, delivered, signed, and declared, I undoubtingly receive and profess; and in like manner all things contrary thereunto, and all heresies whatsoever, by the Church condemned, rejected and anathematized, I equally condemn and anathematize.

“ This the true Catholic faith, OUT OF WHICH NO ONE CAN BE SAVED, I profess, truly and sincerely hold, and to this I promise, vow, and swear. So help me God and the Holy Gospels of God.”

Now, were we not to go farther than the contents of this very document, which contains the accredited faith of the Romish Church, we would have asked the Prime Minister of England, could he in the face of a Protestant public, for one moment have assumed the right of having such blasphemies and errors taught to his Majesty's liege subjects in Great Britain; and if he could not, we would have asked him what right or authority had he to pay money out of the public treasury for having them taught to the priests in Maynooth.

In the great charter of the liberty of British subjects, *the Bill of Rights*—the exclusion of Popery formed a principal feature; and in the oath prescribed to be taken by the King or Queen of Great Britain at their coronation, the maintainance of the Protestant religion as by law established, is specifically set forward, and the exclusion of Popery guaranteed.

Still it may said that Mr. Pitt had taken every precaution to prevent mischief resulting from his concessions to the Popish party—by the guarantee of the oath or declaration, which in the year 1793, it was agreed should be taken by Roman Catholics, and by which every Romanist abjured and

condemned, as unchristian and impious, the various laws made by various Popes against Protestants and heretics. In order to demonstrate the perfect futility of such a guarantee, and to shew the fraud and dissimulation practised by the Romanists of that day, we may here allude to the way in which that oath was agreed to, on which so much stress is laid. The writer of a work in refutation of "A Statement of the Penal Laws which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland, published in 1813," thus describes the transaction—

"The reasons which induced the legislature to enact, that Romanists should take and subscribe the oath and declaration, annexed to the Irish Act of 1793, for the relief of his Majesty's Popish, or Roman Catholic subjects, are as follows ; a very powerful opposition was made to this Act, in the Irish House of Commons ; the debate lasted for some days ; during the debate, Mr. Ponsonby, late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, who advocated the bill, produced a printed paper, containing a declaration, alleged to be published by the Irish Romanists, of the principles of that whole body, in respect to the Protestant establishment and Government of Ireland ; this he read in the House, and argued, that there could be no valid objection to the grant of the privileges contained in the bill before the House, to the members of the sect which held these principles. This argument seemed to have great weight with the House ; and a member in opposition, who knew that the political principles set forth in this declaration were not truly the principles of Romanists, immediately proposed, that the declaration should be converted into an oath, and that all Romanists claiming the privileges in the bill, if it passed into a law, should take this oath, and subscribe it as a declaration ; this proposal was with great

warmth opposed in the House, by the advocates of Popery ; the debate continued to a late hour ; the supporters of the bill were alarmed, and became afraid to put the question on the proposal : an adjournment took place ; and some men, who had a considerable influence in the House, and a great following, who had promised to support the bill, went on that night to the minister who advocated the bill, and informed him, that they and their adherents would vote against the bill, and throw it out entirely, unless the proposal was adopted ; Government was obliged to comply, and the oath and declaration was annexed to, and made a part of the bill."

That the principles pretended to be abjured still continued to be the principles of the Romish religion, was made evident by the fact, that in the year 1812, one of the grievances complained of by the Roman Catholic Committee, then sitting in Dublin, was that the Government required that oath or declaration to be taken. Now Mr. Pitt was well aware of the circumstances under which that form of oath was agreed to in 1793 ; and even during the year which elapsed from the passing of the act in 1793, to the time of the presenting of the petition relative to Maynooth, in 1794, he had numerous opportunities of knowing that the oath of abjuration did not contain the sentiments of the members of the Roman Catholic Church.

It was, therefore, a gross dereliction of the duty of a British Minister, after the warnings and experience he had, to countenance a scheme by which the Church of Rome would not only be advanced ; but by which alienation, hatred, and animosity against

his Majesty's Protestant subjects and Protestant institutions, would be engendered and perpetuated. Had he allowed the Romanists to do what they themselves asked for in the memorial, he could scarcely, under the circumstances, have been blamed ; inasmuch as under the British Constitution the most ample toleration should be acceded to individuals of every denomination ; and there should have been neither let nor hindrance to the Roman Catholics erecting as many academies as they wished—to be supported by their own funds ; but this would have been a very different proceeding, indeed, from supporting or endowing an institution of the kind, in which doctrines and dogmas, completely opposed to the principles which the various members of the British Government had sworn to maintain and protect, would be inculcated. Besides which, by the erection of an Institution in which none but Roman Catholics would be educated, the Government gave a tacit assent to the tenet that “ Roman Catholics are contaminated and rendered guilty of heresy by being educated with Protestants.” To sum up the entire, therefore, looking at the measure in any point of view in which it may be placed, it appears plain that it could not be supported on any ground, not even on the ground of *expediency*, altho' the excuse made by the Government was the necessity and expediency of conciliating the Romish Priests and Prelates, lest they might act in league with the enemies of the country, and instil improper principles into the minds of its people. The measure

was *unjust in principle and unwise in policy*—unjust to the monarch of the country, as fostering within his realms a system calculated to create and continue feelings of distrust and division amongst his various subjects, and by maintaining an authority superior to the throne, ultimately, it might be, to overthrow the throne itself, or at least the Protestant dynasty; unjust to the people at large, as supporting and fostering tenets and opinions which had invariably brought poverty and distress into every land where it had been suffered to prevail; and especially unjust to the Protestants of the country, as forcing them to support an institution which they detested and abhorred, as training men up in superstition and idolatry. It was unwise in policy, as being calculated to estrange the best friends of the Constitution from the ministry that introduced the measure, thereby allowing the friends of anarchy and misrule to come into power, and for a time to carry forward measures calculated to damage the best interests of the country. In a word, it must be evident to every reflecting Protestant that the Grant to support such an Institution should never have been sanctioned by the British Parliament.

Having thus, as we conceive, satisfactorily proved the *negative* of our second proposition, and demonstrated that it was neither right nor proper, nor in accordance with the great principles of the British Constitution, to give a grant of the public money for the establishment of Maynooth—that in fact its establishment at the first was indefensible in principle—we now come to consider the practical working of the measure, in the third question proposed—“Whether the purposes for which Maynooth was professedly established, have been attained or accomplished?” What these purposes were, as ostensibly put forward by the Romish Priests and Prelates, we find in the Memorial which they presented to Parliament:—that said Institution would prove “*a great advantage to the nation at large*”—“*that piety, learning, and subordination would be thereby essentially promoted,*” and that the priests would thereby be prevented from “*becoming very dangerous members of society.*”

To prove that not one of those purposes have been attained or accomplished, we feel to be no very difficult task. The British Minister, however, had promised to himself that a still further good would result from the measure—he had thereby hoped “*to secure the undivided allegiance of the young men trained in the institution,*” that by “*the superior education given to them; a love of order, and of British laws, and of the British Government,*” would have been fostered in their minds. That not one of these results have ensued from the

establishment of Maynooth, time has now unhappily but too fully demonstrated.

In opposition to the first promise of the Prelates, that the institution would prove *an advantage to the nation at large*, we feel persuaded that now, after a fair trial of upwards of half a century, there will scarcely be found one half dozen of any denomination of Protestants in Great Britain and Ireland, who have had the slightest means of knowing anything of its character and proceedings, who would not unhesitatingly pronounce that instead of “an advantage to the nation at large,” it has proved *an intolerable curse*, having, like the Upas tree, spread around it, in every direction within the reach of its baneful influence, poison and death—poison to the mind, and death to the souls of millions. That it was established in opposition to the expressed wishes of numbers of the more respectable Roman Catholics, we have also shewn; and that it was received with little satisfaction by any party connected with that body, save the priests and prelates, is evident from the representations given of it by members of the Convention which sat in Dublin in 1810, and for some years following. Mr. Cornelius Keogh, a very active member of that Committee, in referring to the subject, after mentioning that “the former priests, educated abroad, generally came home accomplished scholars,” observed that “the total contrivance of the institution at Maynooth was for the manifestly intended purpose of replacing them by a set of ignorant, pedantic,

unpatriotic priests," and that up to the year 1810 "such was the moral fermentation amongst the students in the college, that no less than ninety expulsions had occurred," thus affording a fair specimen of the *piety, learning, and subordination* of the students in Maynooth during the first fifteen years of its existence. How much it improved during the subsequent ten or twelve years we shall have an opportunity of showing, from the Report of the Commissioners appointed to inquire into its management, in 1825. One thing is certain, that from the year the first Grant was given, to the present day, the Priests and Prelates of Rome have managed to keep the public mind in one continued fever, by putting forward claim after claim—alternately complaining, cajoling, threatening, fawning, remonstrating, and bullying, as it best suited their purpose; not forgetting, from time to time, vigorously to renew their own demands, not only for equality, but supremacy.

Although after the passing of the bill of 1793, nothing could exceed the apparent gratitude of the Romanists, so much so that Mr. Plowden, the Roman Catholic historian, speaking on their behalf, declared that "by this act the present state of the Catholics of Ireland is settled;" and although in 1795, at the request of the Romish priests and prelates, the College of Maynooth was established—still we find that these concessions were only made the grounds of a thousand other demands, until in the year 1812, the Committee or Convention sitting

in Dublin, and which acted under the guidance of the same Romish Priests and Prelates, in a manifesto which they published, asserted—

“The right of the Catholics to demand, not only the removal of all parliamentary and official disabilities, but the utter abolition of all corporations ; the acknowledgment of the full and unlimited jurisdiction of their church over marriages : the unrestrained exercise of her power of excommunication ; the revival of her lucrative trade of endowments and bequests : actual facilities, marked public encouragements, and a befitting share of the public revenue for her ancient and unbroken hierarchy ;” “a hierarchy not belonging to a sect in the nation, but to the people of Ireland, claiming as a nation, the establishment of its national worship ”

The same Convention declared, at the same time, by way of threat, that they (the Catholics) occupied the most valuable positions for commercial and *military* purposes, and that they were in possession of the most *tenable passes* and the *readiest means of attack and defence*, designating the Grant to Maynooth as “a *miserable pittance*,” not worthy of being mentioned.

Mr. Keogh, a prominent member of the Convention, in a letter to Lord Grenville, at the same time stated distinctly, that

“To satisfy the people of Ireland there must be means adopted which the poor man must feel in his cottage ; there must be a total change of the whole system of government : *there must be the abolition of tithes ; the annulling of all corporate bodies, including the University ; there must be the resumption of the enormous and misapplied revenues of the* INTRUSIVE Church.

If compared with the demands put forward at the present moment by the Romish Priests and Prelates of the present day, it will be seen that they are identical, and it now appears perfectly plain (indeed it is not now denied) that notwithstanding the various disclaimers which these very men put forward from time to time, and the solemn oaths which they took to the contrary, from the first the objects now boldly stated by John of Tuam, priest Cahill, and others, that not only the confiscation of the property of the Established Church, but its being applied to Roman Catholic purposes—or in other words, its being applied to endow the one church in the place of the other—were the objects which were invariably kept in view by Papists of every grade.

To establish the perfidy of those priests and prelates, beyond the possibility of a doubt on the question, we shall here place before the reader a few of the oaths and disclaimers put forward year after year by those perjured men—from the year 1792 until the period at which Roman Catholic Emancipation was granted—

Extract from the petition presented to the Irish Parliament from the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in 1792.

“We solemnly, and conscientiously declare, that we are satisfied with the present condition of our ecclesiastical polity. With satisfaction we acquiesce in the establishment of the national church; we neither repine at its possessions, nor envy its dignities; we are ready, upon this point, to give every assurance that is binding on man.”

Extract from the Roman Catholic oath provided by the Irish Act of Parliament, in 1795.

“I do swear that I will defend, to the utmost of my power, the settlement and arrangement of property in this country, as established by the laws now in being. I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present Church Establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead; and I do solemnly swear that I will not exercise any privilege to which I am or

may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant Government in this kingdom."

Again, in a petition to the Imperial Parliament, in 1805, they renewed the oath, declaring "They can with perfect truth affirm, that the political and moral principles which are thereby asserted are not only conformable to their opinions, but expressly inculcated by the religion which they profess."

And again in 1808, they "Most solemnly declare, that they do not seek or wish in any way to injure or encroach upon the rights, privileges, possessions, or revenues, appertaining to the bishops and clergy of the Protestant religion, as by law established, or to the churches committed to their charge, or any of them."

In they years 1810, and 1811, the oaths were renewed.

In a petition presented in 1812, they say, "By those awful tests we have bound ourselves, in the presence of the all-seeing Diety whom all classes of Christians adore, to be faithful and bear true allegiance, &c. And by the same solemn obligations, we are bound and firmly pledged to defend, to the utmost of our power, the settlement and arrangement of property in Ireland, as established by the laws now in being. *That we have declared, disavowed, and solemnly abjured any intention to subvert the present church establishment,* for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead. And we have solemnly sworn, that we will not exercise any privilege, to which we are or may become entitled, to disturb and weaken the Protestant religion or Protestant Government in Ireland. We can, with perfect truth, assure this Hon. House, that the political and moral principles asserted by these solemn and special tests are not merely in unison with our fixed principles, but expressly inculcated by the religion we profess.

In 1824, John Dunn, Esq., an Irish Catholic gentleman in his evidence before a Committee of the House of Commons, in answer to the question, "What should you say was the opinion of the Catholic body in respect of the Protestant church establishment in Ireland?—I firmly believe the Catholic body have no desire whatever to intermeddle with it; when I say intermeddle, I mean to disturb it, or to appropriate any part of it, to divert it from the establishment; but, in common with the Protestants, they would wish to be relieved from a portion of the burden of it: our earnest wish would be for every possible guard and barrier, and fence, and protection to the established church, and that all her rites and immunities should be preserved."

At the same time, the Right Rev. Dr. Collins, then parish priest, afterwards Roman Catholic Bishop, being asked, "Do you think, with respect to the establishments of the country, with respect to the existing Protestant church establishment, that that would not remain a cause of complaint and grievance?—Not at all; the church establishment is a temporal establishment, as connected with the constitution of the country: they have no jealousy on that score.

"Do you sincerely believe, that, generally speaking, in the minds of the Roman Catholic clergy, there is not any disposition to disturb or dispossess the Protestant hierarchy?—I do most sincerely believe it, and would make the most solemn declaration to that effect; I can undertake to say, that not a single Catholic clergyman in Ireland will contradict what I aver, that they, as Catholics, have no views whatsoever to the disturbance of the establishment.

In 1825, the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle was examined before a Committee of the House of Lords.

"Do you conceive, that there exists a desire on the part of the Catholic church generally, or of many individuals in it, supposing the arrangements referred to in a former question to be made or not, to possess themselves of any part of the revenues of the church of England?—Whether such arrangements were made or not made, I never discovered in others, nor have I entertained myself, any disposition whatever to be put into possession of any portion at all of the revenues or property belonging to the Established Church.

"Without meaning to doubt what you have stated, were it possible to suppose such a disposition to exist on the part of the Roman Catholic church, is it one that would find any countenance or favour on the part of the Roman Catholic laity?—Unquestionably not; they would be more averse to it than the Roman Catholic clergy, if more averse to it they could be.

"Entertaining those tenets, how do you conceive that a Roman Catholic ecclesiastic can recognize and engage for the maintenance of a Protestant ecclesiastical establishment? I do not see any thing more easy than that, because the State in which we live has been pleased in its wisdom to establish a certain mode of worship, and to give certain immunities and privileges to the clergy of that establishment; this entering into the State as an integral part, why should not we support the State which supports that establishment?—I do not see, certainly, how that interferes at all with our tenets; but I view it just in that light in which I have placed it before your Lordships."

Extract from the address of the Irish Catholic Association to the people of England, in 1826.

"Far from meditating the overthrow or destruction of the Protestant Government and Protestant establishment of the empire, we are ready to swear, as we already do swear, to support, &c. &c.

Extract from the Pastoral Address of the Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland, to the Clergy and Laity of their Communion throughout Ireland. Published in 1826.

"The Catholics of Ireland, far from claiming any right or title to forfeited lands, resulting from any right, title, or interest, which their ancestors may have had therein, declare, upon oath, that they will defend, to the utmost of their power, the settlement and arrangement of property in this country, as established by the laws now in being. They also 'disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment, for the purpose of substituting a Catholic establishment in its stead.' And further, they swear, 'that they will not exercise any privilege, to which they are or may be entitled, to disturb, and weaken the Protestant religion and Protestant Government in Ireland.'"

"The archbishops and bishops add, emphatically, 'This full and authentic declaration, we approve, subscribe, and publish &c.'"

Extract from the declaration published by the British Roman Catholic Bishops, in 1826.

"He who takes an oath is bound to observe it in the obvious meaning of the words, or in the known meaning of the person to whom it is sworn. . . .

“British Catholics are charged with entertaining a pretended right to the property of the established church in England.

“We consider such a charge to be totally without foundation. We declare that we entertain no pretension to such a claim. We regard all the revenues and temporalities of the church establishment as the property of those on whom they are settled by the laws of the land. We disclaim any right, title, or pretension with regard to the same.”

Extract from an address from the British Roman Catholics to their Protestant Fellow-countrymen, in 1826.

“Fellow-countrymen,—We present to you a declaration drawn up and signed by those ecclesiastics who, in this country are the expounders of our faith. We beg earnestly to call your attention to this document, which distinctly repudiates the obnoxious tenets imputed to us. The Irish bishops have given a declaration of Catholic principles similar in effect to this.”

A published letter, addressed by the Right Rev. Dr. Doyle to the Duke of Wellington, dated June 19, 1826, concludes by stating:—

“That the Catholic body wishes emancipation to be settled on the basis of preserving and securing every existing institution, whether Catholic or Protestant, in all their integrity.”

On the 18th of March 1829, the Relief Bill being under the consideration of Parliament, Sir Wilmot Horton, read to the House the following extract from a letter which he had received from an Irish Peer, and in which he said, Mr. Blount, Secretary to the British Catholics, fully concurred.*

“That in prohibiting the Catholics from legislating upon the affairs of the established church, he (Mr. Horton) would exact no sacrifice, but, on the contrary, afford them a relief from a most disagreeable and irksome duty; were it possible, indeed (continued the writer), to suppose that the Catholics should be admitted to Parliament unfettered by any restrictions or disqualifications, I should feel it my duty to act under the influence of such an opinion, and abstain from taking any part in the discussion, when the subject of the privileges of the established church come under consideration. (Hear, hear.) This, too, was the opinion of a very distinguished Roman Catholic, Mr. Blount, Secretary to the English Catholic Association. This was the language and feeling of men of high honour and principle, &c.”

In addition to the foregoing, need we refer to what is so generally known, that the oath taken by Roman Catholic Members of Parliament, pledges them, specifically, not to interfere in any way with the revenues of the Established Church. The subjoined specimen of the *swearing*, and subsequent

* To Mr. Eneas M'Donnell, himself a Roman Catholic, the public are indebted for having collected these various documents, which will be found in full in his published “Letters.”

acting, of the late Mr. Daniel O'Connell, will serve to shew what reliance is to be placed on oaths so taken, by such persons, under such circumstances.

Mr. O'Connell and the other Roman Catholic members, on taking their seats in Parliament, took the following oath—

"I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment, as settled by law within this realm. And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify, and declare, that I do make this declaration, and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words of this oath, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatever."

Now let the reader mark the contrast and contradiction; the absolute perjury which succeeded.

In the report of "The National Association of Ireland," dated April 1840, and signed Daniel O'Connell, Chairman, it is said "the great grievance of Ireland is its Ecclesiastical revenues;" and that the first duty of Irishman must be to obtain by constitutional and legal means, its total abolition."

Again in October, 1841, Mr. O'Connell took the oath, and on the 7th of April in the following year, at a meeting of the Repeal Association, the same Mr. Daniel O'Connell moved the following resolution—

"RESOLVED—That the leading practical objects of the Loyal National Repeal Association, during the current year, are declared to be, and shall be—Firstly—The Total Abolition of the Tithe Rent-Charge, &c."

On the 23rd of the same month, from a report in the Freeman's Journal of the proceedings of the Repeal Association, we find him using the following language—

"As long as the Irish people are compelled to support a Church Establishment from which they derive no benefit, they are *SERFS*. Our first basis of Repeal is the *EXTINCTION* of the Tithe-rent charge.

"DANIEL O'CONNELL."

Consequently, on the 16th June, 1842, we find him in his place in Parliament, supporting Sir John Easthope's motion for "the abolition of Church rates."—See Hansard, 63 p. 634.

To some, such perfidy may appear astounding; need it be wondered at, however, when we find the Roman Catholic Bishops and Archbishops setting him the example! Let the reader peruse the following, and then say are the Priests and Prelates of Rome trustworthy or not? are they men to be believed on their solemn oaths? or are such men fit to be entrusted with an establishment such as Maynooth should be?

And first, as a prominent character, we shall adduce the private opinions of the same Dr. Doyle, who in his examination before a Parliamentary Committee, as given in a preceding page (56), solemnly disclaimed any intention of interfering with the Church Establishment. In his "Letters on the State of Ireland," (page 104) he says—

"The most heart-rending curse which Providence has permitted to fall on the land occupier in Ireland, is the Church Establishment; this, like the scorpion's tail, is armed at all points, and scourges the peasant through tithes, and church rates, till it draws his very blood. This establishment not only strips him of food and raiment, but it also insults him by the monstrous injustice of obliging him to give his sweat and labour, and the bread of his children, to build or repair waste houses, whilst he himself is left to pray in the open air; to feed the parson and his rapacious family and followers, who go about, not doing good, but to vilify and calumniate the religion which this peasant reveres; it compels him to purchase bread, and wine, and stoves, and music, for the church which he deems profane; to pay the glazier, and the mason, and the sexton, and the grave digger, who divide his clothes between them, and cast lots, like the Deicide Jews, upon his cloak."*

* This same Right Rev. Bishop, in the same letters, gives the following description of the landed proprietors of Ireland—

"The great mass of our little esquires, who are called gentry, are men of much pride and little property, possessing a few hundred pounds a year. God knows how acquired; labouring perhaps to keep a carriage, if not, to have at least a dog, a horse, and a gun. They are made up of every possible description of persons. I could delineate them accurately and minutely, but I think it better to state generally, that a great portion of these men are the very curse and scourge of Ireland. They are numerous, they are very ignorant, they are extremely bigotted, they are exceedingly dishonest, they tell all manner of falsehoods, and so frequently, as to assume with themselves the appearance of truth. In a word, they could not be entrusted with your honour or your purse, and multitudes of them have no regard for the sanctity of an oath; they are those men who often obtain the commission of the peace, and trade

In a letter to the Bishop of Exeter, written some time after by the notorious John of Tuam, he says,

“Far, then, from shrinking from any avowal of hostility to a system fraught with such injustice, I must frankly own that the establishment has been, and shall continue to be, the object of every legal and constitutional opposition in my power. However irreconcilable you may deem such a declaration with the obligation of our oath, I must protest against your competency to expound its meaning as the guide for my theology.”

And again, in a letter to the late Duke of Wellington, he says,

“Your Grace is not, I trust, one of those persons who imagine that the mere will of the sovereign or his ministers imposes the obligation of law, nor is it, I trust, your impression, that every enactment brings with it that solemn sanction, provided it is passed by a majority of the senate. No, my Lord; all the united authorities of the sovereign and the senate can never annex the conscientious obligations of law to enactments that are contrary to reason and justice; and hence the stubborn and unconquerable enmity of the minds of the people of Ireland against those odious acts (I will not call them laws) which have ever forced them to pay tribute to the teachers of an adverse creed.”

In several letters and speeches of the said John of Tuam, and others, similar and even much worse

by it: who get all the little perquisites arising from grand jury jobs, who foment discontent, who promote religious animosity, who are most zealous with the saints in distributing tracts and bibles, who are ever ready to attend vestries, to impose taxes, to share in their expenditure, to forward addresses, to pray for the Insurrection Act, or any other act which might serve to oppress the people, and render permanent their own iniquitous sway.”

Surely after such a picture it is not much to be wondered at if the Irish peasant should be led to think that by shooting or otherwise exterminating such a class, he was doing God's service.

sentiments have from time to time been openly avowed. But not to tire the patience of the reader by referring to passages in which the clergy of the Established Church are execrated and reviled, and the revenues of the church denominated “ blood-stained imposts” and a thousand statements of the same description, we shall merely in addition adduce a letter which that celebrated demagogue, waxing yet more bold than before, in September last, addressed to the Earl of Derby, and in which he gives vent to his feelings in the following unmistakeable language—

“As for the Protestant establishment, dream no longer of upholding it in Ireland; treat it like the question of free trade, yielding to the inevitable necessity of events which statesmen cannot control. The Catholic people of this country are resolved not to be content until they witness its legislative annihilation. The axe is already laid to the root, and as time has but too well attested the baneful vices of its influences, it is in vain you will endeavour to avert its inevitable fall.

“ These ecclesiastical funds, so long misused, should, after the life interests of their present occupants, revert to their original purposes of promoting Catholic piety, charity, and education. Too long has their usufruct been squandered with no other result than propagating dissensions and upholding an unholy ascendancy. It is fortunate that there remains such a fund for the erection and endowment of Catholic schools, and the building of Catholic churches, and should it extend so far, to serve for an outfit for the purchase of Catholic glebes, all as free and independent of any sinister interference of the secular power as were those funds when first abstracted from those pious uses. It is only on such conditions they will be claimed—on no others

should they be accepted—and on such equitable terms it would be the height of impolicy to withhold them.”

This is, indeed, speaking out like a man, for with all his faults we must do John of Tuam the justice to say he has uniformly maintained the same ultra principles, and advocated the same ultra measures. While others were dissembling, he spoke out the real sentiments of the Romish Prelates—and that these were their real sentiments we now find fully verified by the acts and speeches of the very men who solemnly swore to the contrary. As it might still be said, however, that these were only the expressions of individuals, it has now been officially affirmed by a document just issued from the Popish Propaganda, who meet in this city, under the title of “The Preparatory Committee of the Friends of Religious Equality”—a junto of Popish Members of Parliament and others, appointed by the Priests and Prelates of Rome to prepare for active measures against the present Government, and the Protestant institutions of the country, when Parliament next meets—the Chairman of which Junto is Mr. Geo. Henry Moore, M.P. for Mayo—one of those individuals, who at the table of the House of Commons, took a solemn oath that he would not use his privilege as a member of that House, for the weakening or subversion of the Protestant Establishment. This document, which will be found at length in the Appendix, enters fully into the iniquitous designs of this unholy alliance, which, in violation of every pledge given by the Priests and Prelates, and by

the Members of Parliament, in no wise to interfere with the revenues of the Established Church, recommends as a first measure the entire confiscation and sale of those revenues—in what way to be ultimately disposed of they could not agree on; but, inasmuch as a special objection was made to their being applied either to education, to the poor, or to any secular purposes, as a natural consequence there remains but one other way, that pointed out by John of Tuam—the endowment of the Popish Church in Ireland.

No doubt in order to induce mere nominal Protestants to join them in their plans of robbery, they have left the division of the stolen property an open question, with a hint that to a small extent the different denominations may share in the spoil. From a perusal of the document itself, it will be seen that a scheme of a more revolutionary character could scarcely have been planned.

And now, placing the various documents, as it were, in juxta position, we ask any disinterested man to say is it not self-evident, that those individuals who as Members of Parliament, took the oaths having reference to the Protestant Establishment, or are about to take them, and who immediately afterwards join an association for its overthrow, are guilty of *deliberate perjury*; and is it not equally evident that the priests and prelates have all along been guilty of practising a series of gross and wicked deceptions, for the purpose of obtaining that power which they are now so shamefully abu-

sing. Again we ask, are such men worthy of any trust, or can they for one hour be depended on? Are such the effects of the training in Maynooth? and shall such an institution be perpetuated to form such characters? Let its best friends say has the training in Maynooth prevented the priests of Rome from becoming "very dangerous characters?"

Here in passing, we ask also is it any wonder that the common people should be so notorious for lying, cheating, and false swearing, when they have placed before them such patterns of perfidy, in those to whom they have been taught to look up as to their spiritual guides, and who have had the undivided control of their religious education. Taking this view of the subject, we ask further, does it not appear plain that Maynooth, instead of being a blessing, has proved an unmitigated curse to Ireland?—is it not evident that the present degraded state of the lower orders of the people may be traced to the instruction given, in the first place to the priests in Maynooth, and by them afterwards transmuted into the minds of the Romanists under their care, in the various districts of Ireland where Popery prevails?

As, however, the consideration of the subjects bearing on this point more properly belongs to our fourth proposition, we shall not pursue it further at the present, but proceed to consider a little more fully whether or not the actual purposes for which Maynooth was established have been realized.

To come at once, then, to the point on this parti-

cular, we may observe that the real object of establishing Maynooth was to provide for the Roman Catholic population a priesthood, *Roman Catholic* no doubt, but at the same time *educated* and *loyal*; it was intended they should be neither Atheists or Protestants; but while educated strictly in the Roman Catholic faith, it was also designed that they should at the same time receive a good, well grounded secular education; and be trained in principles of attachment to the British Constitution. By such a course of study, the British Minister hoped to secure an enlightened Roman Catholic priesthood—*loyal* men—who would eventually become attached to British laws—and although, as we have shewn, in any case the establishment by a Protestant Government, of an institution designed to teach the doctrines of Popery, was unconstitutional and unwise, still had the Government, after setting it on foot, looked to it that the original design was carried out in its integrity, in place of proving a complete and total failure, as is the case, some portion of the objects proposed might have been obtained. Had the Government seen to it that along with their religious studies, the students had received a good secular education, the priests reared in the seminary would not be the class of characters they now are. Any individual anxious to know how the matter really stands, has only to consult the evidence given before the Commission of Inquiry. From this it will be seen that in place of the students in Maynooth receiving a sound, and

judiciously selected course of classical instruction, joined to lessons in moral, physical, and natural philosophy, which would have enlarged the mind, and exercised the intellect, the course pursued in their education, has been directly the reverse—the greatest pains have been taken not to expand the mind, but to contract it ;* not to cultivate a spirit of inquiry, but by every possible means to repress it ;

* The full course of study lasts for seven years, but that this is merely nominal will appear evident from the following extract from the statement of Mr. Inglis, who visited Maynooth, in 1834.

“ The course of study at Maynooth is arduous, and as laid down in the Report of the Commissioners of Education, very extensive. I was shown this report, in answer to my interrogatives as to the course of education ; and, I confess, I was greatly surprised to find it so varied and so liberal. But upon a little further questioning, I learned that this course is not adhered to, and that “ only as much of it is followed as can be accomplished ;” these were the words used, from which I infer that the course of instruction is entirely optional with, and varies at the pleasure of the heads of the College ; and that whoever forms any opinion of the course of education at Maynooth, from what he has read in the report of the Education Commissioners, will fall into grievous error.—Ireland in 1834, vol. 2. p. 332.

“ In the Appendix to the Government Report it appears, that the Professor of Mathematics, the Rev. Nicholas Callan, being asked ‘ About what proportion of the class would be able to answer the questions contained in the ordinary books of Astronomy, about eclipses ? ’—answered : —‘ I should think there are very few in the class who would be able to explain the principles upon which an eclipse is calculated, because they are not fully explained to them : the year is at a close at the time they are reading that part of Astronomy ; and therefore the Professor has not time to explain those principles fully ; but I think that the majority of the students, perhaps, and a good deal more than the majority, would understand the cause of an eclipse. They are able to tell why an eclipse happens at certain times, that is, they are able to tell that it happens from a shadow being projected in a certain way ! ’ ”

“ To another question from the Commissioners, he replied : —‘ I think that those who have extraordinary talents, or even very good talents, will make a very good proficiency in Arithmetic (!) I do not say that they will be acquainted with all the questions that can be treated of in Arithmetic, but with the four rules of Addition, Subtraction, Multiplication, Division, and with the Cube or Square Root ! ’ ”—(See Appendix No. 21, p. 145.)

It may be said that since the Commission sat, matters have improved, and that in consequence of the larger Grant the education is much better than formerly. This is a great mistake. The increased sum asked for was to enlarge the college, and allow of a greater number being educated—but the system has not been changed ; it is, and must of necessity be the same as long as the principles of Popery govern the Institution.

not to let light in, but to keep it out. That these are really the facts of the case. any one, we repeat, may satisfy himself by consulting the evidence taken by the Commission referred to. In consequence, the Maynooth student grows up in comparative ignorance of every thing but his duty to the Church, and the implicit obedience he owes to the Pope, and the Prelates presiding over the institution. Knowing the power of the men under whom he receives his education—who can make or ruin his future prospects by their single fiat—to obey their commands is his greatest pleasure, and to obtain their regard his greatest anxiety and care. Indeed the system of training in Maynooth is most extraordinary ; Protestants, accustomed to breathe the free, invigorating air of the British Constitution, can form but a very imperfect idea of the system of mental slavery in which those subjects of the Pope are regularly initiated ; and all with a view of breaking down their minds to the idea that they are neither to act or even think for themselves, or in any way differ in the slightest degree from the acts and thoughts of those, in whose good wishes they live, and move, and have their being.

The system of surveillance, or rather of espionage, attends equally the studies and the recreation of the students. In fact, so fearful are the principals of the college, of the effect that would be produced by the cessation of this discipline, that although there are nominal vacations, the students are scarcely ever permitted, during their term of

study, to visit the domestic hearth, or to converse familiarly with the friends of their early youth. The entire spirit of the establishment is the very opposite of the freedom and liberality observable in Protestant institutions. In order to produce the most efficient instruments for extending the Papal power—while, to raise the clergy above the mass of the people, they impart a certain quantity of a particular kind of knowledge—at the same time, to protect them from any thing like a spirit of liberality, they are secluded from society, and are kept in the grossest ignorance of that general information, so requisite for men moving in their sphere ; nor are they allowed more than an occasional glimpse into politics ; just so much as will prepare them for future activity in the defence of the Church and the Pope. In consequence of the mists and vapours connected with the darkest ages of the Roman Catholic Church, which are constantly kept before their view, as the *summum bonum* of all proper education, their minds become impenetrable to every ray of improvement consequent upon the discovery and experience of progressive ages.

The consequence is, their education and training makes them what we have elsewhere described*—they leave the institution the slaves of their bishops, to become the tyrants of the people ; whom they, in their turn, designedly keep in ignorance, and over whom their system of spiritual terrorism enables them to maintain the most unlimited authority.

* See Religious Statistics of Ireland, by P. D. Hardy, p. 47.

The course pursued, we may also observe, is designedly intended, not to teach submission to the constituted authorities of the land, but fierce and unmixed ultra-montanism; or, in other words, a doctrine which attributes a universal, spiritual, and temporal omnipotence to the Pope of Rome—fidelity and allegiance to him, and to him only.

Now to foster and encourage the very opposite of all this was evidently the object and design of the British Government in permitting the establishing of Maynooth, and in subsequently maintaining it. No doubt the Romish Prelates promised faithfully that such should be the case—that the various suggestions of the Government should be complied with. It should be noted, however, that the British Minister had reckoned on realizing an actual impossibility—it could not be that a Roman Catholic priest could be *true to the principles of his church* and at the same time a *loyal* man. While it might be possible, that priests educated in France, Infidels or Atheists, as many of them were, might be loyal, it is evident a sincere Roman Catholic Priest or Prelate, living in a Protestant state, could not be a loyal man. He has sworn fealty to the Pope, and to defend the rights of the church against all aggressors—rebels against the Pope, heretics,* &c. How, then, can such an individual take the oath of allegiance to a British Sovereign, who according to his creed, he must look upon as a heretic,

* “Heretics, schismatics, and rebels to the same our Lord, or his successors aforesaid, to the utmost of my power I will persecute and attack,” are the words of the oath.—See oaths of Priests and Prelates in *Pontificale Romanum*.

and out of the pale of salvation? Is it not evident, therefore, that a conscientious Roman Catholic priest cannot be a loyal man, or true to the Protestant Government under which he lives? * Referring to the evidence given on this point, it appears that any oath of allegiance taken by a priest must be broken when the good of the church requires it, and that a belief in the *deposing* power of the Pope is still an article of faith. Surely then, this being the case, it is self-evident that a priest can only be a loyal man so long as the good of the church does not require him to be disloyal.

The testimony of Professor Anglade is as follows,

“Are the Commissioners to understand the proposition, about which you are now examined, as meaning simply this; that if a person, implicitly bound to obey another, takes an oath which that other prohibits him from fulfilling, this discharges him from the oath, although the person prohibiting him may commit a sin in so prohibiting him? I THINK SO.” †

This is tolerably plain speaking. Dr. M'Hale in his evidence is not less explicit—

“The Commissioners find the following proposition laid down in a part of Bailly's book, now used in Maynooth, in the second volume of Moral Theology, page 140:—‘Proposito. Existit in Ecclesia potestas dispensandi in Votis et Juramentis. Prob. 1, ex Scripturis Matt. 18.

* Dr. Doyle in his evidence before the House of Lords, gave it as his opinion, that if a rebellion raged from Cape Clear to Carrickfergus, not a priest would put forth his hand to prevent it.

† This same Dr. Doyle, in his letters signed J. K. L. p. 22, speaking of prosecutions of Roman Catholics for “offences against the peace of our Lord the King,” says:—

“The witnesses as often labour to conceal, as to manifest the truth: one class of them anxious to defeat the law, the other only intent on procuring conviction; both regardless of the obligation of an oath, and perfectly indifferent about contributing to the ends of justice.”

We learn from the testimony of Mr. Inglis, vol. i. p. 284, that—

“As to find out the truth by the mere evidence of witnesses, it is generally impossible. To save a relation from punishment, or to punish one who has injured a relation, an Irish witness will swear any thing.”

Quæcunque solveritis super terram, erunt soluta et in cœlis. Hæc verba, cum generalia sunt, non solum, significant potestatem solvendi vineula peccatorum, sed etiam votorum et juramentorum.' You observe, that it is there laid down in the broadest and most unqualified manner, that there is in the church a power of loosing, not merely from the bonds of sins, but also from the bonds of oaths, and it is there asserted, that that can be proved from the 18th chapter of St. Matthew, in which it is stated, 'whatsoever things ye shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven;' do you attach that meaning to the word 'solveritis,' that is attributed to it in this passage? Yes, I think it may be susceptible of the meaning of dispensing from oaths.....Without further investigating whether the doctrine is to be deduced from that particular text, we beg to know whether you believe the doctrine, that is, whether you believe, as is there laid down, that there is in the church a power of dispensing from oaths! Surely, in the sense the proposition is laid down and explained by the author.

Let us now see what that sense is in which this proposition is explained by the author, and which Dr. M'Hale here admits to be correct —

"We find it laid down in page 145, of that class-book, that the following are just causes of dispensation in those causes, viz. first, the honour of God; secondly, the utility of the church; thirdly, the common good of the republic; and fourthly, the common good of society.' (Mark how the good of the church takes precedence of the common good of the state and society.) 'Who is to be the judge of what the utility of the church may require? The superiors of the church. Does it not appear there to be laid down as a universal proposition, and without any qualification, that the utility of the church was a just cause for dispensing from oaths? It is laid down as a proposition, {that THE UTILITY OF THE CHURCH IS A CAUSE."

The accuracy of this testimony is fully supported by the evidence of Mr. Dixon (a converted priest). He was asked

"Was that your opinion when you were in charge of a parish? At the period of time when I was admitted to priest's orders, and at the period of my professional duty, it was. Your opinion was, that though you had solemnly sworn allegiance to his Majesty, and though you had sworn that it was no article of your faith that the pope was infallible—though you solemnly declared before God, that you did not think that you could be absolved from that oath by the authority of any pope, or

any bishop, or any authority of the see of Rome, although they should declare that it was null and void from the beginning—notwithstanding all that, you held the reverse, of what you so expressed and swore to? I held that the pope could absolve me from the obligations of the oath of allegiance.—Although you swore to the contrary? Yes; such was the impressions I brought with me in consequence of my education, that the pope could absolve me from all this, if it had any tendency to promote the interests of the church.”*

Again, as to the *material sword* being subject to the *spiritual*, and as to the *deposing power of the Pope*, we have the following testimony—

Dr. Higgins in his examination, speaking of the material sword, observed, that “it should be subject to the spiritual sword, that is, it never should defend any cause opposed to the law of God, of which law the church and the Pope as the head of that church, has the right of judging.” And finally he stated, that “he could not tell how long it is since popes have changed their mode of interfering with temporal claims.”†

Dr. Crotty, in reference to the deposing power, remarked, “I beg leave to observe, that the Popes who have claimed the right of interfering in temporals, do not rest their claim on the decrees of these Councils, but on certain passages of Scripture, to which Roman Catholic divines do not attach the meaning given them by the ultramontanists.” In opposition to this opinion, Dr. Doyle and Dr. Slevin gave it as their decision that “the right of interference is only founded on some obsolete claim or other in temporals” by the Pope “to this realm of England.”

Such is the evidence, taken before the Commissioners of Irish Education Inquiry, to which Mr. Blake, himself a Roman Catholic, and one of the Commissioners who signed that report, refers, as containing an impartial account of the Roman Catholic College at Maynooth.

The class books referred to contain many pass-

* See Irish Education Report, VIII. Appendix p.p. 283, 284.

† In 1809, in excommunicating Bonaparte, Pius VII. declared that his persecutors are subject to his authority by the law of God; and that “any acts against the temporal rights of the church subjects them to the severity of the sword which the Church has handed down.”

ages quite as important on other points ; such as the following—

“The church retains her jurisdiction over all apostates, heretics, and schismatics, though they do not now belong to her body, as the leader of an army has a right to punish the deserter, although his name be not upon the roll.”*

“Heretics are bound by the ecclesiastical law, because by baptism they are made the subjects of the church ; nor are they more delivered from the laws than subjects who rebel against their princes.”†

During the examination of Dr. M'Hale, he was forced to admit, that he was the author of a violent and inflammatory pamphlet, which contained several seditious, if not treasonable paragraphs, and which the publisher, Mr. Coyne, proved had been presented to the president, and distributed amongst the students. This pamphlet, written at this early date, by one of the Professors of Maynooth, gives ample testimony of the instruction the students received under his particular teaching. The pamphlet contained one of those bitter and virulent attacks on the Established Church, for which his subsequent letters and speeches have been so notorious ; and yet Dr. M'Hale told the Commissioners he had not the *slightest apprehension of expulsion* on account of his violation of the statutes of Maynooth, by the writing and circulating of such a work. Surely comment is unnecessary on the effect which such instruction must have had on the minds of the students.

* Delahogue, Tractatus de Ecclesia, p. 404.

† Bailly, vol. i. 179.

The great object to be attained by the establishment of Maynooth, it will be remembered, was, that the priests would be altogether an altered and improved class of persons. Now we would like to know in what way has this improvement been evidenced? Are they better subjects of her Majesty? Are they more peaceable—more disposed to live on good terms with their Protestant neighbours, than the priests educated abroad were? On the contrary, have they not latterly become “desperate demagogues”—the “very dangerous characters” set forth in the memorial presented to Parliament in the year 1794. Instead of Maynooth having secured the allegiance of the young men educated in it, by affording a superior education—or produced in their minds a love of order or of the British laws—is it not a fact proved before the Commission of Inquiry, that it has been, since its commencement, little better than a hot-bed of sedition and disloyalty? It has been shewn that one of its professors, Dr. M'Hale, published and distributed among the students, a work encouraging disloyalty and rebellion. It is also a fact that from insubordination in consequence of improper training it was found necessary to expel within fifteen years, no fewer than ninety of the students, and that many others should since have been expelled is evident, as it was proved before the Commissioners of Inquiry, that one of the most frequent topics of conversation amongst the students in Maynooth, was the possibility and practicability of a forcible separation of Ireland from Great

Britain, by a simultaneous rising, by disarming the troops, and by killing the Protestants. To the Report of the Commissioners we refer for the truth of those allegations; and inquire still further, is it not equally true that the rebellion of 1848 was fomented by priests educated in the institution? While it is likewise made plain, by the language used publicly by some of the heads of the institution, that at the present moment the most virulent and violent ultramontane principles are inculcated on the minds of the students?

Looking at the question in all its bearings, we ask, have one of the beneficent results, so glowingly described, and so confidently promised by members in favour of the establishment of the College, been realized? Indeed, some of the Protestant speakers lived long enough to discover their error—that their hopes had been founded on the “baseless fabric of a vision,” which the experience of a few short years completely demolished and dissipated.

The fact is, the monies granted to Maynooth, were never applied to the procuring for the students a *better education*—we have before demonstrated that such was not, and could not have been their wish; the *additional funds* were appropriated to the support of an *additional number of students*, a measure which we shall presently shew was altogether unnecessary.

On the full consideration of the case, therefore, we feel that any impartial judge must come to the conclusion that not one of the advantages which were

to result from the establishment of Maynooth, has been realized—“*piety, learning, and subordination have not*” thereby “*been essentially promoted,*” but directly the reverse—for although the students have been well grounded in the ultramontane doctrines of the Romish religion, they have not received a good secular education, which was the chief object the British Minister had in view in establishing the institution—the “*undivided allegiance*” of the students has not thereby been obtained; for it has not fostered a *love of order, of British laws, and of the British Government*; nor have the priests thereby “*been prevented from becoming very dangerous characters.*” On the contrary, we affirm that the present priesthood are much worse in every way than those educated abroad—the present men being, not only, as described by Mr. Keogh in 1812, “an ignorant and pedantic,” but a seditious, overbearing, disloyal, intolerant class of men, to whom no favour or affection should be shewn by any Government. We ask, could the Roman Catholic priests have been made more anti-British in any French school? This we shall further demonstrate in our remaining pages.

Having in our preceding remarks offered ample proof that “the purposes for which Maynooth was originally established” have not in any one particular “been attained or accomplished”—we now proceed to the consideration of our fourth and last query, “Should the Government, after the experience of

nearly sixty years, continue the Grant? would it not be a gross dereliction of duty in them were they to do so?"

It will have been observed by the reader, that in considering our second question, should such an institution as Maynooth ever have been established by a Protestant Government? we confined our statements relative to the institution, to the period preceding the Union of Great Britain and Ireland. We shewed distinctly that up to that period there was nothing said or done by the Irish Parliament that could induce the Trustees of the institution, or the Roman Catholics of the country, to suppose that it was the intention of the Legislature to give to it a permanent support; that on the contrary, one of the last acts of the Irish House of Lords, in refusing it even an annual grant, left on record their attestation that the Legislature was in no way bound to render it any support whatever.

In the year 1800, the state of the institution being brought under the notice of the British House of Commons, and it having been argued that in consequence of the political state of the Continent, if the Grant were withdrawn at that time, the priests must remain uneducated, a sum of £8000 was granted towards its support. The act relative to it was amended by the Act 40 Geo. III. cap. 85, by which several alterations were made in the internal arrangements of the house; by the 8th sec. however, it was again enacted, as before, that nothing then done should interfere with any bye-laws, rules,

or regulations, affecting the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion, or the worship thereof, in the institution ; and to make assurance doubly sure, in the 9th sec. it was again repeated, that in matters affecting the exercise and doctrine of the Roman Catholic religion, the visitorial powers were to be exercised only by such of the Trustees as were Roman Catholics, in the presence of the said Chancellor and Judges, *if they think proper to attend*, while the 10th sec. provided that three of the Trustees should always be Roman Catholics. The Bill was further amended in the year 1808, (48 Geo. III. c. 148) the Trustees being at that time granted power to purchase land to the amount of £1000 a year in addition to what they then possessed.

Year after year the propriety of the Grant was debated in Parliament. The following brief analysis will afford some idea of the arguments used from time to time on either side, and shew how mistaken were the supporters of the Grant.

In the debates February 20, and March 4, 1807, on the Miscellaneous Estimates, on the motion that £5000 be granted in addition to the £8000, for the further accommodation of students in Maynooth,

Mr. Perceval, objected to it on the ground that "it would form a precedent for an additional sum the year following, and so on continually ; and that while he would vote for the £8000, as it had been granted by the Irish Parliament, he would oppose any addition. He considered the Grant calculated to promote the establishment of the Romish religion in the country, and that it would prevent the sons of gentlemen being educated in Trinity College for the priesthood. He complained that although the

annual Grant had been only intended as an aid, it had then become the only fund for the education of persons intended for the priesthood. He would impress upon the House that the first Grants were given on petition year after year."

Sir John Newport, in reply, argued that "under the circumstances of the world at that time, were the Grant to be refused, it would amount to saying, that the persons intended for the Romish priesthood should receive no education at all, in consequence of the seminaries in which they formerly had been educated having been broken up—that it must be admitted Roman Catholic priests would not be made better subjects by being educated abroad—that since Maynooth was established, the demand for priests had increased."

Mr. Grattan "wished to see Protestants and Roman Catholics go hand in hand. If they could be educated in Trinity College, he would rejoice at it. Keep the Roman Catholic at home—home education will promote allegiance—foreign education can engender no great loyalty—kept at home, and taught to love his country, he must revere its Government." He argued for the vote on the ground that "a large sum had been given to the Protestant Charter Schools and other Protestant institutions; and met the objection, that 'the institution might be made the medium of disseminating disloyalty through the means of the professors,' by asking was it not subject to the controul of Trustees, the Chancellor, and the Judges of the land?"

Lord Mahon observed, that "as the influence of the Roman Catholic priests in Ireland was well known to be extensive, it was an inestimable benefit to have the care of their education committed to the Government."

Mr. Wilberforce "could not help saying that the institution would tend to discourage the growth of Protestantism in Ireland. He allowed it was not only criminal but cruel to oppress or restrain the Roman Catholic religion—

but it was no oppression not to favour it to the detriment of the Protestant establishment.”*

In the debate on the Maynooth question, July 15th, in the same year,

Mr. Hawkins Browne demonstrated “the anomaly of a college being maintained within the realm at the expense of the State, to educate a clergy for the purpose of propagating a religion which every member of that House was bound to abjure before he could take his seat ; a religion of superstitious intolerance, and persecuting principles. If the Irish Roman Catholics wished to educate their priests, let them do it like the Protestant Dissenters, at their own cost.”

Mr. Wyndham, in reply, “asked was it not better for the State they should be good, enlightened and loyal Catholics, than be left in ignorance, barbarism, and disaffection ? Was it not better the Roman Catholic priests should be educated under the eye of the Government, than to imbibe their education under the auspices of an enemy.”

The Chancellor of the Exchequer† observed “the honorable member had talked as if the priests had been under the care of the Government. He begged to say all the Government had to do in the matter was to bear the expense of the establishment—the least thing that could be done, was to give the Government something to say in the management of the institution, that they might know that they were not educating a society of Jesuits, who would not be suffered to exist in any other part of Europe.”‡

In the debate, April, 1808,

Mr. Foster proposed an additional Grant for the support of fifty new students.

Sir Arthur Wellesley (late *Duke of Wellington*) said “the fact is, when Maynooth was at first established, it was not intended it should be maintained by the public

* See Hansard, v. 8, p. 938. † Right Hon. Spencer Perceval.

‡ See Hansard, v. 8, p. 1086, v. 9, p. 818.

purse—the memorial originally presented to the House prayed for a charter to appoint Trustees to receive funds for the purpose.” His lordship also objected to educating a “greater number of priests than were at that time in the institution, as the number then educated added to those trained up in other institutions, would be quite sufficient for Ireland.”

Mr. Ponsonby insisted “that there had been an understanding between Government and the Catholics, that a sum should be granted sufficient to support four hundred students. He asked, “was it wise to refuse the Catholics such a favour—to how many worse purposes would the house vote away many such sums? Considering the influence which the clergy, of every denomination, in every country, had over the people, it was right in statesmen to keep the clergy in good humour with them.”

The Chancellor of the Exchequer replied, that “whatever might have been the understanding between the Catholics and the Government of which the right honorable gentlemen was a member, Parliament did not stand committed by any such pledge. As to the assertion that the vote he would give was dictated by bigotry or intolerance, he could not admit that it should be ascribed to either. It was no part of religious toleration to make a provision for the education of the clergy of the tolerated sect. If so, they ought to go much farther, and do the same for the Methodists, Anabaptists, and Quakers. It was the duty of the State to provide for the education of the ministers of the religion of its own establishment, but the same obligation did not apply to other sects. If he had his choice he would much prefer the priests should be educated in open seminaries, in different parts of the country, where their intercourse with their friends would not be precluded, rather than have them educated in one great monastic establishment.”

Mr. Grattan asked, “while the spirit of Bonaparte pervaded the Continent, was that a time to refuse the Grant

to Maynooth, which would send the priests abroad for education. He doubted that the priests had as much influence over the people as was supposed. If they wished the Catholics of Ireland to be well conducted, they would make their priests objects not of contempt, but of *veneration!*!"

Mr. Croker "objected to the endowment, because the education being gratuitous, the persons educated were from the lowest ranks of life; and if this were not the case the higher classes of those who belonged to the Roman persuasion would bring up their sons as clergymen, of which, at that time, there were few or no instances."*

Again in May 5, 1808,

Colonel Montague Matthew asked "Would any one say that the Catholics were not to be confided in? Unless they acted liberally towards the Catholics they would run the hazard of losing Ireland."

The Chancellor of the Exchequer again disclaimed the odious principle of intolerance—the memorial which led to the establishment of Maynooth claimed no pecuniary aid. The Catholics promised to defray the whole expense themselves, and though the Government and Parliament gave the £8000 in aid of the object, that was no reason that the country should be subject to continually increasing demands, for a purpose of which there was no precedent in any age or country, that of educating at the public expense, the priesthood of a religion differing widely from the established one."

Mr. Wilberforce remarked, in reference to observations of some of the members, that "Toleration, both as explained by Locke and Rousseau, was 'to leave to others the right of professing and teaching their own religious principles in their own way, as far as was compatible with the peace and security of society.' As far as an establishment

* Hansard v. 11, p. 90.

was supported at the public expense, for the purpose of instructing a particular class, differing in sentiment from the established religion of the country, we went beyond the bounds of toleration—and evinced a degree of liberality unknown in any other country—no man was a greater enemy to persecution than he was, but he wished to see the Protestant religion getting fair play.”

Mr Laing contended the question was not one of toleration or of bigotry, but of pure legislation. It was only by conferring benefits on the Roman Catholics that their affections could be gained, or that they could be rendered good and loyal subjects, and he would support the Grant.”

Dr. Duigenan read the oath of the Catholic priests, “to shew that they paid an obedience to the Pope which was inconsistent with the King’s supremacy. The provision for the education of the Protestant clergy fell far short of what was given to the students in Maynooth. There were in the University of Dublin thirty poor scholars, who got nothing but a dinner in the day ; and seventy-two scholars of the house, who got no lodgings, and merely their dinner in the house.”*

On March 9th, 1812, on the motion of Mr. Pole that the annual Grant of £8973 be given to Maynooth,

Sir John Newport considering the increase of Catholics in the country, moved “that the sum be increased to £13000, the amount granted in some former years.”

Mr. Secretary Ryder “resisted the enlargement of the Grant ; if this had been the first time of proposing the Grant he would vote against it. He did not wish to debar the professors of any religion of its most enlarged and liberal toleration, but he was not for giving a hostile religion the power of making proselytes.”

Mr. Grattan “supported the addition to the Grant on account of the increase in the population.”

* Hansard, v. 11, p. 125.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Perceval) “opposed the addition on the ground that the Grant for Maynooth had been the same from 1801 to 1806 ; but in 1807, when the administration then in power were doing every thing to encourage the Romish religion, they in *one* session of Parliament had procured a grant of £13000—but this grant was merely the act of that Parliament—and with that Parliament it fell.”

During the debate it was asked by those opposing the measure—Must not Roman Catholics suppose that we consider the difference between the two religions unimportant, when we train up the people in the opposite faith to our own ?

It was asked also, would Roman Catholics, if in power, educate, at the public expense, Protestant clergymen for the Protestant Church, to propagate what they might consider heretical doctrines ? Do they now do it in any country in the world, or have they ever done it ? And must not Protestants feel equally averse to educating men in doctrines which they believe to be erroneous and dangerous ?

The additional Grant was refused.*

July 7, 1817.

Sir H. Parnell “moved for certain papers, in order to refute certain calumnies relative to Maynooth College, which were calculated to defeat the object which every true friend to his country should have at heart, *the complete union of all religious sects ! ! in one common cause*, for the support and preservation of the laws and constitution. The charge brought against Maynooth, by the honorable member (Mr. Foster) was, that doctrines peculiar to Papal Rome, inconsistent with the legitimate and necessary authority of Government, were still taught at this college—that the transalpine doctrine had but two spots in Europe on which it could rest its foot—the Vatican and Maynooth. It was unnecessary to remind the House that

* Hansard, v. 21, p. 1226.

the doctrine was no other than that by which the Pope was in ancient times suffered to claim a temporal authority in all Catholic countries. But with every respect for the honorable member who had published to the world that this doctrine was still taught at Maynooth, he must say, that a statement more entirely destitute of foundation never was made. In point of fact, so far from this statement being correct, if there exists one Catholic church more independent than another, it is the Catholic Church of Ireland—and the truth is, that no communication scarcely ever takes place between the Bishops and the Pope, except for the purpose of obtaining canonical institution for a newly elected bishop!! This arises from the circumstance that the discipline of the Irish Church renders every bishop wholly independent of the Pope in the tenure of his office, and gives him every necessary power for the administration of the duties of it. The Irish people were much too intelligent and high-minded to yield a servile obedience to a mere name, and to a false and fictitious authority. They obeyed their clergy, because their clergy in the first instance succeeded in instilling among them a proper notion of religion, and of their duty as good Christians!! and the clergy held their authority only by their conduct and their precepts, that the principles of the religion which they taught, were deserving of being respected and obeyed!! their efforts are incessant in all questions, and at all times in teaching obedience to the laws!!” As an instance of the excellence of the education they gave the people, Sir Henry mentioned a number of their books; among others, the *Path of Paradise*, the *Garden of the Soul*,* and Butler’s *Catechism*—of the latter

* This work having been introduced by some Roman Catholic persons into the Penitentiary at Millbank, soon became so popular with the most abandoned of its inmates, and was productive of so much evil, that it was prohibited by the Government, as a book of obscenity and vice.

he said 500,000 copies had been sold by one bookseller during one year. As a proof that the Romish priests did not object to the reading of the Bible, he mentioned that six different editions of it had been printed, and seven of the New Testament.

Sir J. C. Hippisley, in reply, "complained that in all the discussions on this important subject, none had ever yet taken place that could be deemed satisfactory—no inquiry into the real tenets of Catholics—no inquiry—no evidence whatever."*

August 5, 1831, on a petition against the Grant,

Mr. Wyse observed "that if Trinity College was to be opened, and made a public establishment, there would then be sufficient grounds for discontinuing the Grant. It was to be lamented we did not imitate other nations where a mixed religion prevailed. He himself had been educated in it."

Mr. Lefroy denied "that the Dublin College was exclusive. Roman Catholics might obtain degrees in it. If they did not wish to attend the chapel they were excused."

Mr. James Gordon "considered the doctrines taught at Maynooth unchristian. He agreed that the Romish priests should receive a liberal education, but he denied that Maynooth afforded that—the Government with one hand gave £40,000 to support education on Christian principles, and with the other £8000 to destroy it."

Mr. O'Connell, in reference to the honorable member having called the Catholic doctrines unchristian, observed, "that the same spirit might be sufficient to qualify him for the office of Chief Inquisitor of Spain. Three hours each day were the students employed in reading the Scriptures.† He knew the students well, and could assert that few bodies of young men possessed more extensive knowledge than they did."‡

* Hansard v. 36, p. 1310—14.

† For refutation see Appendix.

‡ Hansard, v. 5, p. 1818.

August 31,

Sir Robert Inglis presented a petition against Maynooth. The petitioners stated "that the institution had entirely failed. One object was educating respectable men at home for the priesthood. This had not been effected. The individuals educated were persons of inferior rank. It appeared that of two hundred and five individuals in the college, six were the sons of merchants, one of an apothecary, and one of an architect, while the remaining one hundred and ninety-seven were the sons of farmers? (cottiers), graziers, grocers, &c." *Sir Robert* observed "that when reductions were made in Wide Streets, and a variety of other items, he did not see why it should not be applied to Maynooth."

Mr. O'Connell "denied that Maynooth had not produced able men, and mentioned *Dr. McCabe* as an example. He contended that the Roman Catholics desired to read, and did read the Bible; but they objected to making it a school book. They were not idolaters. They worshipped the living God, and the living God only."

Lord Killeen "denied that the great body of Roman Catholics were averse to the reading of the Scriptures. He would assert Maynooth produced men of high character; there were seventeen Roman Catholic Bishops who had been educated there, and they were most anxious to encourage obedience to the laws."

Mr. Spring Rice observed, "that if the Grant were withdrawn the Roman Catholics would support Maynooth themselves—and if there was now danger, the danger then would be greater."*

September 26th, 1832,

Mr. Perceval, before going into Committee, observed—"As Protestant Christians it was inconsistent and unfaithful in them to be voting annually a Grant for the purpose

* Hansard, v. 6, 3rd series, p. 921.

of educating men to teach religious doctrines which they held to be a system of falsehood, and a corruption of the word of God; another reason was, that the Government had withdrawn the Kildare-street grant, while they continued this; and even upon the principle of his opponents, this Grant ought also to be withdrawn, and he moved that the Grant should not be continued another year."

Mr. Secretary Ryder objected to the vote on various grounds, among others, "because from all the information I can collect, and I am told that many Roman Catholic gentleman agree with me in opinion, the object for which the college was established has been completely frustrated. I mean the educating of a priesthood which should be more enlightened, liberal, tolerant, and loyal than those trained abroad."

Mr. Stanley observed, "that if by consenting to this Grant he could imagine he promoted the ascendancy of the Catholic religion, or impaired the interests of the Protestant faith, he would acknowledge, it was not consistent with the duty of that House to sanction the Grant." He then referred to the causes which had induced Mr. Pitt to sanction it, with the concurrence of Mr. Fox, and the authority of Mr. Grattan—as also to an offer made by Buonaparte to have the students for the Roman Catholic priesthood educated in France, and the offer being rejected by the Roman Catholic Prelates of Ireland. "Knowing the state of feeling in Ireland, he did not hesitate to say that the Protestant religion in that country would be placed in imminent danger by the rejection of the Grant. It would be considered a breach of faith on the part of the Government on various grounds, which he contended were political and not religious; he contended for the propriety of the Grant, especially on the ground of justice to the Roman Catholics, and security to the Protestant Church."

Lord Mandeville observed, "there was one question which every member ought to ask himself before he came to a decision—was not the great object of the establish-

ment of Maynooth to disseminate amongst the population of Ireland, that the doctrines which the Protestant Church held to be true, were sinful and heretical? On what principle could Protestants encourage the dissemination of doctrines which they believed to be false.”*

In April, 1832, on a petition for discontinuing the Grant,

Mr. Maurice O’Connell begged the House to remember that the Grant had not been sought by the Catholics—the Government at the time thought proper to propose it to them.”†

July 27, 1833,

Lord Ingestre “opposed the Grant, on the ground of the priests being the great leaders of sedition and agitation; and because the priests educated at Maynooth were found to be more violent and more opposed to the institutions of Great Britain, and to British connection, than those educated abroad—they were inferior in every respect, both as to education, conduct, and loyalty, to those who had been educated abroad. He knew no one who had ever dissented from that opinion.”

Mr. Sheil denied the assertions of the noble lord, and said, “he would venture to assert there was no greater friend both to British connection, and submission to the ruling authorities, than the Professor of Dogmatic Theology in Maynooth.”‡

April 18, 1834,

Mr. Sinclair “opposed the Grant on the ground that those who were educated in Maynooth, were less well-affected than others to the institutions of their country. He should as soon think of granting money for a college to train officers, who when trained would direct all their efforts to overthrow our civil institutions.”

* Hansard, v. 7, 3rd series.

† Hansard, vol. 12, p. 307.

‡ Hansard, v. 14, 893.

Mr Spring Rice supported the vote on several grounds, amongst others the length of its continuance, and the circumstances under which it had originally been granted. "He would ask, was the year 1834 a time when a powerful priesthood should be made to feel that their loyalty and attachment to British connection were ungratefully forgotten?"

Mr. Cutler Ferguson "was prepared to vote money not only for the education of the Catholic clergy, but if necessary for the Hindoo priesthood, too—as religious instruction tended to civilize men."

Mr. Baldwin observed "that there were other colleges in Ireland for the education of Roman Catholic clergy, and if the Grant to Maynooth were withdrawn, these would increase in public patronage, and the propagation of the Roman Catholic religion would increase in proportion."*

March 3rd, 1840,

The Earl of Galloway in presenting a petition relative to Maynooth, observed, "that if the books used in Maynooth were of such a character as described in the petition, it was inconsistent with the duty of a Christian Government to supply funds for its support—of this, he had no doubt, that a Roman Catholic college established for purely Roman Catholic purposes, was inconsistent with the security and safety of a Protestant State."†

June 23, 1840,

Mr. Plumptre, Member for Kent, in presenting several petitions against the Grant to Maynooth, observed, "there was a growing feeling amongst the Protestants of England, that they ought not to pay for the dissemination of a religion that was at once idolatrous and unsocial." The prayer of the petition was that the Grant should be discontinued.

Viscount Morpeth, in reply, observed, "there might be a general objection to the Grant of public money for the

* Hansard, v. 22, p. 976.

* Hansard, v. 52, p. 845.

instruction of the Roman Catholic clergy; but taking the propriety of such a grant as admitted, then with respect to the system carried on in the college, and the mode in which the Grant was administered, he contended they were more subjects for the consideration of the Catholic clergy themselves than for the honorable member for Kent. So also with respect to the books used in the institution, and the studies pursued there. For himself, he did not feel it was any part of his duty to inquire into these matters. He believed the books were the recognized books of the Roman Catholic Church, but he believed also, that on these points the House had no more right to enquire than any Roman Catholic member would have to object to books used in Oxford or Cambridge. With regard to the system of instruction pursued in the college, a Commission had been prayed for by that house, and a specific report had been laid on the table. The statement thus laid before the House in the 8th report, in the year 1837, was as follows—

“ ‘The instruction given in the divinity classes generally, in Maynooth, we are assured, does not differ materially from that given in the University of Paris. The discipline maintained in the college is stated to differ very little from that which is observed in other institutions for the education of the Roman Catholic clergy.’ ”

The noble lord denied the persons educated in Maynooth were of a much lower class than those who usually filled the ministerial office.”

Sir Robert Inglis, in reply, stated that “the honorable member had uttered sentiments which would not have been tolerated in any member of the Government forty years before. The Government was bound to support the religion of the State, and that religion alone which the State recognized as truth. There were something like thirty-six votes for charities, which the Irish Parliament regularly maintained, and so long as these votes remained unaltered, he (*Sir Robert Inglis*) had not resisted the vote for Maynooth; but when Parliament had taken away from other institutions the money which the Irish Parliament had

granted, then every case stood on its own merits—and those who stood on the claims of precedent, and of a legacy from a deceased Parliament, here ceased to have a firm footing.”

Mr. Sheil, in reply, observed, “that the case of Maynooth rested on a clear compact before the period of the Union. He felt that point had not been relied on as strongly as it ought to be.” *Mr. Sheil* then referred to the establishment of Maynooth by *Mr. Pitt* in 1795, and recited 35th Geo. III.—this act having been passed, another act was passed in 1800, confirming the former act, and making further regulations; and, said the honorable member, “thus Maynooth, before the Union, became one of the national institutions of Ireland.”

Mr. Litton observed, “that if ever there were such a compact as that referred to, a portion of it was that doctrines useful to the morality, the religion, and the peace of Ireland should be taught in that college; in opposition to this, the doctrines inculcated in the seminary were full of intolerance to the Protestants of the country—there were doctrines of gross immorality, others stated that the allegiance to the Pope was higher than allegiance to the lawful sovereign of these realms—doctrines inimical to the best interests of the nation at large.”

Mr. H. G. Wood, in reference to a previous speaker having quoted the language of *Mr. Pitt* to shew that the object of *Mr. Pitt* was “to establish a college of loyal men,” “would ask the honorable baronet for Oxford, whether the scholastic establishments of England had answered that end? was he satisfied in this respect with his own college?”

Sir Robert Peel “could not agree in the prayer of the petition—for if there had been a compact, as was contended, that compact would be quite as much violated by the House pledging itself to withdraw the Grant at a future period, as if it were then done. For his own part he did not think there were sufficient grounds for violating an

implied understanding on which Parliament had acted for thirty years, and he could not agree to any motion for withdrawing the Grant, unless stronger grounds were made out to shew him he had been previously in error in granting it. He did not mean to say there had been any contract entered into, but originating as the Grant did, and having survived so many changes, he could not help thinking that a concurrence with a pledge would shew a hostile disposition towards the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He could not, however, concur in an observation of the noble lord. *He did not think there existed such a compact as ought to prevent the interference of the Legislature if the Grant should be perverted to evil purposes !*"

Mr. M. J. O'Connell "felt bound to state that the feelings of a great number of Roman Catholics as to this Grant was positively indifferent."*

March 2, 1841,

Mr. Colquhoun, in moving for leave to bring in a bill to dis sever all communication between Maynooth and the State, contended that the original design intended in the establishment of the institution by Mr. Pitt in 1795, had been altered by the act of 1800. The act of 1795 placed a controul over the college in the hands of the laity, as well as a controul on the part of the Government—the change made by the act of 1800 frustrated the intentions of Mr. Pitt and of the laity. By this act the trustees were divided into two portions—one constituted the visitors, the other the trustees. The visitors were composed of five Protestants and three Roman Catholics—two only of them being ecclesiastics. A majority of these visitors was composed of laymen, but they had no power. All the authority in drawing up rules, appointing professors, &c. was transferred to the trustees, and these were altogether Roman Catholics, and four-fifths of these were ecclesiastics, with the power of filling up their number as any vacancy

* Hansard v. 55, p. 43.

arose ; so that instead of attaining the object of Mr. Pitt ; securing to the Government a large majority in the management, the act of 1800 reversed the whole management, deprived the Government of all controul, turned the visitation into a complete farce, and handed over to the trustees an unlimited power. Mr. Sheil had spoken of a compact ; of that compact he entertained a very different opinion from the honorable member. It had been formed between three parties—the Roman Catholic laity, the hierarchy, and the Government. Mr. Keogh, the agent of the Roman Catholic body, had expressed their views on the subject, “ the plan of the College should include Catholics, yet should not exclude any other religious persuasion, and that *it should depend on the people for its support.*” Mr. Emmett had made a similar statement. But the whole of the system had been changed by the subsequent enactment, as the college was at that time under the exclusive superintendence of seventeen Roman Catholic ecclesiastics—it was manifest, therefore, that if there had originally been any compact, that compact had been broken. In reference to the effects of the books taught in Maynooth on the minds of the priests, that they went to dissolve all allegiance to the sovereign and every social bond, the learned member adduced the evidence of Mr. O’Connell, before the Committee of 1825, as follows—

“ The priests who were educated in Fance, were old men when I became a man, and I found that they entertained a natural abhorrence of the French revolutionary principles. They were strong anti-Jacobins, and there was amongst them a great deal of what is called ultra loyalty ; but this is not the case with regard to those educated at Maynooth. The anti-Jacobin feeling has gone by, and the priests are now more intimately identified with the people ; and as to what was usually called loyalty, the priests educated at Maynooth do not come within the description of it to such an extent as those educated in France.”

In reference to the authority exercised by the priests in Ireland, the honorable member quoted the following evidence—

“ Dr. Leighton said if any person should vote contrary to the wishes

of the priest, if he attended any fair or market, strangers would fall upon him, and give him a most unmerciful beating. Cases of this kind have occurred in King's County, Kerry, Carlow, Kildare, Tipperary, and Galway."

"Mr. Fitzgerald—No man could vote contrary to the priest without danger to his person and property."

"Messrs. Wilcox, Despard, and Finn—Such was the state of tyranny that no Roman Catholic dare act independently."

"Lord Kenmare—System of intolerance."

"Messrs. Miller and Lalor—Those who voted against the Catholic party were denounced as traitors. The people would not deal with that man, nor associate with him: Freeholders in Carlow feared to be murdered, or have their houses burnt."

"Such were the practical effects of the doctrines taught in Maynooth, and he asked, was such a system to be tolerated and continued. In other countries, Austria, Prussia or France, no priest would be allowed to denounce a man from the altar—but the priests of Maynooth used the altars of the Church for purposes inconsistent with the liberties of free subjects."

Mr. O'Connell observed, "in respect to charges made that night against Maynooth, that for his own part he would say emphatically, he firmly believed in all that was taught in Maynooth. To be sure the Catholic priests took a part in elections, and why should they not? They spoke from the altar against perjury and bribery; but he defied the honorable member to shew by evidence that they went further. Where on the face of the earth was there a people with so much zeal for their religion, with so much practical piety as the people of Ireland? True, they had their errors; revenge was perpetrated among them, and under its influence many were scattered abroad, and met with untimely deaths; vengeance had broken through the restraints of religion, and the feelings of humanity; but he could with pride, in comparing his countrymen with either England or Scotland, affirm, that in Ireland crime was infinitely less in individual atrocity, than in either of the other portions of Great Britain. The Irish were a religious and a moral people, and true religion and morals were

still spreading through the land. Let, then, the honorable member (Mr. Colquhoun) study his own religion more, and the religion of others less. He had brought forward charges against the Catholics, but he had taken care not to give his authority."

Mr. Sergeant Jackson, in reply to Mr. O'Connell's observation, said "that he would give the honorable and learned member for Dublin, chapter and page in proof of his friend's assertions. His honorable friend had referred to a statement made by Mr. Emmett, who had been a member of the Convention that sat in Dublin in 1793; that statement was, that

" 'The Educational Committee, (which had been appointed by the Roman Catholic Convention) had formed a plan for the mixed education of Roman Catholics and Protestants, to be dependent on the people for support, and to be under the joint controul of clergy and laity. But that the Roman Catholic hierarchy privately stated this plan to the Government, and proposed a system, to be under their exclusive controul, and purchased the assent of Government to their proposition, by presenting an address to the Crown against Defenderism.'

"But the real questions at issue were two; first, on the books referred to by Mr. Colquhoun, used in Maynooth, are they the class books required to be in the hands of the students? secondly, do those books contain the pernicious and revolting matters stated by his honorable friend? Now he asserted, that both these questions must be answered in the affirmative; and he was prepared to prove by documents, and indisputable evidence, the accuracy of what had been stated by his honorable friend in both particulars." The learned Sergeant then gave several quotations from the class books in proof of his assertion. "Honorable gentlemen opposite, no doubt, sincerely repudiated those doctrines: so did all persons of the Roman Catholic faith who previous to 1829 had been examined before the Committee on the subject: but did not the college of Maynooth, notwithstanding these disclaimers, still persevere in teaching these doctrines, and was it not the solemn duty of Parliament to put an end to such abuse." In re-

ference to persons being put in jeopardy of their lives, in consequence of having been denounced from the altar, the learned Sergeant observed, "that the fact had been put on record before the Committee on Bribery at Elections. A question had been asked, 'How many priests are repealers?' to which the answer had been, 'Almost the whole body.' Now he had the authority of her Majesty's ministers for saying that the object of the repealers was the dismemberment of the empire, and the withdrawing of Ireland from beneath the sceptre of our gracious sovereign, therefore no truly loyal subject could be a repealer. He held in his hand an account of a Repeal Meeting in Dublin, in which Mr. Davis, a Roman Catholic priest, handed in 74*l*. from seventy-four Roman Catholic clergymen, observing, that before that day week there would not be a single Roman Catholic clergyman in Ardagh but would be a repealer. If this were the true feeling on the part of the clergy, little doubt could exist as to the sentiments of those they governed, and these were the natural fruits of the education given in Maynooth." The learned Sergeant referred to a statement of Mr. Wyse, the member for Waterford, that the system pursued at Maynooth was one calculated to inculcate democratic principles, and that its pupils, the priests, must, by the course of events, become more powerful, and concluded with some general remarks.*

April 3rd, 1845,

Sir Robert Peel observed, "that during the preceding session, he and his colleagues had stated their intention of inquiring into the state of Maynooth. He was not therefore unprepared for the demonstration which had that day been made upon the subject, by the presentation of petitions against it. The state of Maynooth had undergone his deliberate consideration, and he and those who acted with him had come prepared to recommend to extend the

* Hansard, v. 56, p. 1221—1270.

parliamentary provision to the institution—not to interfere with the doctrines or discipline of the Roman Catholic Church, but by a more liberal provision, to improve the system of education, and to elevate the tone and character of the institution—the sum given, £9000 per annum, was just sufficient to discourage voluntary contributions—if it were withdrawn, he had no doubt the people of Ireland would provide an endowment for the education of the priesthood, by voluntary contributions. But what is our position—if it be a violation of principle to provide education for the Roman Catholic priesthood, we are equally guilty by granting £9000 as a larger sum. I believe the discontinuance of the vote would be better for all purposes, than the continuance of the niggardly allowance now given ! !” The honorable member went into detail to shew the time and the circumstances under which Maynooth was established, and argued that it would be ungracious not to follow out what had been commenced by the Irish Parliament. “He would propose to incorporate the Trustees, and to make them a body politic, by the name of the Trustees of Maynooth College, and permit them to hold real property to the amount of £3000 per annum.” In reference to the visitorial powers, he observed, “we will not spoil the act by any attempt at novel and ungenerous interference with such matters. In all matters connected with the doctrines and discipline of the Romish Church, such powers can only be exercised by three visitors, members of the Roman Catholic Church—we introduce no new principle ; that which we propose is the widening of the foundation of Maynooth in proportion to the increased demands for the services of the Roman Catholic priesthood.”

Sir Robert Inglis observed, “that it was because he felt a deep and solemn persuasion that there was no objection in point of honor and good faith to his doing so, as well as no objection in the statute law, that he felt bound to oppose his right hon. friend. It was a fact that the Irish House

of Lords negatived the Grant in 1799, and thus practically deprived the case of that practically strong ground which it might have had, if it had rested upon an altogether unbroken custom."

Mr. Gregory "was far from convinced by any argument of the right honorable baronet, of the policy of the measure proposed—the object of establishing Maynooth was to provide not only a well instructed, but a loyal and peaceful class of men, and the fallacy of those expectations they had lived long enough to experience. If Mr. Pitt fell into the mistake, the error was most pardonable; he had not had the benefit of experience: he and the Government of the day had every reason to expect a happy result from the experiment. Mr. Grattan had been quoted by the right honorable baronet as the great advocate of the measure;—he (Mr. Gregory) would quote his words in 1808, and ask the House have his expectations been fulfilled? The experience of the past year ought to convince any British Government that the endowment of Maynooth has not promoted the tranquility of Ireland. Could we have a prettier paradox than the present bill—to render evil impotent we increase its powers; by paying a premium to agitation, agitation will be settled. Far better would it be for the right honorable baronet to have proposed suitable funds for colleges in various parts of the country, for the education of every persuasion; where Irishmen would meet Irishmen, and where kindly feelings might be engendered—this would be much better than an extended grant to Maynooth, for its present purposes."

Viscount Sandon "would vote for the measure of the right honorable baronet, because he looked upon the matter as one of compact, and as due to the Roman Catholics of Ireland. He could not forget the appropriation of all the church endowments of Ireland; that after taking from the Roman Catholics their ecclesiastical property, we had forced their priests into foreign countries, for the purposes of education. We had refused them indemnity for the

loss of their property ; and therefore, under all the circumstances, he could not refuse his best support to the motion of the right honorable baronet."

Mr. Plumptre, in reference to the proposed measure, asked, "Where was all this to stop? If they were to take under their care, and entirely support the Roman Catholic college of Maynooth, to increase the number of its students, and to give a liberal support to its President and Professors, would not those concessions prove stepping stones to something further. He thought the Government might just as well call upon the house to support the priests of the majority of the people of India, or to support the Mahomedan religion."

Lord John Russell "did not mean to argue, as had been done by other honorable gentlemen, the question of compact, or whether it would be wise or prudent after fifty years to stop the Grant suddenly ; but at the same time I will say *if you found you were doing that which was mischievous to the community*, and that the religious scruples of the community would not allow of the continuance of this Grant, or with reference to civil or political reasons, you found that those whom you meant to be teachers of religion, had become the leaders and conductors of rebellion ; if, I say you found that for any of these causes, there was ground sufficient to refuse this Grant, then I can see no valid reason why any compact should restrain you, or why upon strong grounds of this kind, the House would not be justified in declaring that it would give no further allowance. If gentlemen came forward and said, 'I denounce this Grant altogether ; I will not join in the sin and guilt of maintaining the Roman Catholic religion,' I can perfectly understand this—but for those who at any time concurred in the Grant of £9000, to say they object to £26,000—he could see no ground for restriction on religious scruples. We must all know that the great majority of the people of Ireland belong to the most ancient branch of the Christian Church ! (?) and I believe that

the instruction conveyed to them by priests of their own religion will tend to make them more religious, more moral, better men, aye, and better Christians, than otherwise they would be ! I consider the Grant rather in the nature of a restitution than an original grant ; and in making it a permanent endowment, I think there is the indication of further measures than those now proposed—with which I would fully agree. The arguments advanced would prove equally sound and incontrovertible with respect to an endowment for the maintenance of the priesthood. For my own part, preferring most strongly a religious establishment to that which is called the voluntary principle, I am anxious to see the religion of the great majority of the people of Ireland endowed by a provision furnished by the State, and if such a question should be proposed, I would concur in it ! ! !”

Mr. Cumming Bruce, in allusion to Lord John Russell's observation as to the measure being one of restitution, “ would ask the noble lord would he return to the Roman Catholic Church some of the extensive ecclesiastical property held by his family ? Would he endow a new Maynooth at Woburn, or at Tavistock ? If he did this, he would give him credit for his sincerity.”

Mr. Shiel “ considered Government were taking a step in the right direction—they must not pay the clergy—but they could take the church under their care. They could build houses of worship and glebe houses, upon a sure and irrevocable title—but the perfect independence of the Roman Catholic clergy was indispensable.” In reference to the political transition which had passed over the country since Maynooth was established, the honorable member observed, “ When Maynooth was founded there were not more than two or three Roman Catholic barristers in Ireland. We have seen a Catholic Chief Baron, a Catholic Master of the Rolls, and four Roman Catholics holding the high office of Attorney-General in Ireland. When Maynooth was founded no Roman Catholic was

admitted to Parliament. The majority of Irish members are now returned by Roman Catholic constituencies; the same change was apparent in the Corporations, in nearly all of which Roman Catholics had the preponderance. Four years passed in Trinity College would constitute a bad apprenticeship for the Confessional!! He denied that the greater number of the students in Maynooth were even of such low origin as described. The Catholic priests were now not only pure, but unsuspected; and for his part he was not anxious to see the sons of the Roman Catholic gentry in the church. The Catholic church has a sort of ennobling influence, and the consciousness of spiritual authority often imparts dignity to those who are not highly born!! How often in the olden time did the untried plebeian stand erect before the Norman baron, and in the cause of the serf and of the peasant, with the crozier turn aside the lance?"

Mr. T. Duncombe "objected to the vote. From what they had heard that night it was plain the ultimate object of the vote was to endow another church."

The first reading of the bill was carried by a majority of one hundred and two.*

April 11th, 1845.

Sir Robert Peel having moved the second reading of the bill,

Mr. Colquhoun reiterated several arguments before used—in reference to the effect of the education in Maynooth on the priests brought up in that institution, he would ask "what part had they taken in the political agitations which had recently convulsed the country?" and read the subjoined description of the priests educated in Maynooth from the History of the Roman Catholic Association, by the honorable member for Waterford—

"For the most part they had been educated at Maynooth, and had carried with them all that spirit of independence and democracy, which

* Hansard, v. 79, p. 103.

of late years has more or less become the characteristic of Irish Catholic education ; they were full of the spirit of the times, and thoroughly acquainted with every detail of recent politics."

" There was another crisis—the repeal crisis in 1843—the violence and hostility of which we all remember. It is a significant fact that the priesthood, almost to a man, were embarked in that movement. I will read to you the observations of an eye-witness, understood to be a gentleman who received office under the late Government, who now holds office, and who addressed, in October, 1843, the following letter to the *Morning Chronicle*—

" The most serious fact of all connected with the present agitation has yet to be mentioned. There cannot be a doubt that the great body of the Roman Catholic priests have gone into the movement, in the worst, that is, the rebellious sense. Many of the priests of the old school, who had been educated in France, and who had seen the world, held out for a time; but they were given to understand, that if they continued to take this line, the shepherd would be deserted by his flock, and they were forced to yield. But the curates and young priests brought up at Maynooth, have gone into it heartily to a man. These young men are generally the sons of small farmers, and other persons of a similar rank in life : they therefore bring with them strong feelings, and limited and one-sided information from home, and at Maynooth they are brought up like our young Newmanite clergy at Oxford, to regard the church as the sole object for which they are to live, and think, and act. They have no property, no families of their own, to be compromised by a rebellion, and as it would be inconsistent with the character of their sacred profession, to appear at the head of their flocks, on the field of battle, they run no risk. They may gain, but they cannot well lose, by the result of a conflict. Some more hardy and enthusiastic than the rest, might even lead their flocks to battle; but whatever their conduct in this respect might be, there cannot be a doubt that the prevailing spirit of the priesthood is correctly represented by the following expressions, extracted from the speech of the Rev. Mr. Cantwell, parish-priest of Tramore, at the late monster meeting at Lismore, 'He could support O'Connell with his voice—but he would support him with more. Look at that arm (said the reverend gentleman, stretching forth his right arm) after the magnificent scene I have this day witnessed, I'll die a death—or see Ireland free.' (*Tremendous cheering, waving of hats, &c.*) The priests have given to the repeal movement all the weight of a religious cause in the eyes of a superstitious people."

The honorable member observed, "He could multiply in-

stances, but would give only one more, from a gentleman living in Ireland, who says—

“ I never heard the subject of the priesthood mentioned, that it was not universally considered that the priests educated abroad and at Maynooth were perfectly distinct classes. The one well disposed, peaceable, and of kindly feelings towards all; the other turbulent, assuming, political, and hostile to the British Constitution.”

The honourable member then described the difference between those educated in Trinity College and Maynooth, as detailed to him in a letter by a friend—the former being mild, inoffensive, and gentleman-like in his demeanour—the latter a perfect firebrand.*

Several other members, in both Houses of Parliament, stated their opinions at considerable length; but on looking over the debates, we could discover no new argument materially affecting the points at issue; the statements made by honorable members being a mere repetition of the sentiments expressed on previous occasions, of which the foregoing, though a brief, may be relied on as a faithful summary.

By referring to the speech of Sir Henry Parnell, and others acting with him, it will be seen that they were altogether under a delusion. His object, as stated by himself, was “ the complete union of all religious sects;” than which, as appears from various facts referred to by other members, nothing at any time was farther from the intention of the Romish Prelates. He denied that the students were taught in Maynooth “ the doctrines peculiar to Papal Rome;” and adduced as a fact, the assertion that “ the Irish Roman Catholic Church, was alto-

* Hansard, v. 79, p. 110.

gether independent of the Pope, who he said, “scarcely ever had any communication with its Bishops, in consequence of the discipline of the Irish Church rendering the Bishops independent of the Pope!” he also “denied that the reading of the Bible was prohibited by the Roman Catholic priests!”

The fallacy of these arguments was made apparent by several members, who in subsequent sessions spoke upon the subject. The facts brought forward by Mr. Perceval, Mr. Colquhoun, Mr. Sergeant Jackson, and others, distinctly demonstrated the gross delusion under which Sir Henry and his friends had acted.

How completely deceived the so-called *liberal* Protestant advocates of the Roman Catholic claims were, by declarations of the Popish Priests and Prelates of that day, will be seen by the following extract from the speech of John Wilson Croker, Esq. in the House of Commons, in 1819—

“Much as I respect the claims of my Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, I am not ashamed to confess, that my first and greatest object is the security of the Established Church. I would not diminish, I would not put into peril one jot of her dignity, one jot of her income, one jot of her splendour, one jot of her stability; but to preserve all these, to protect them even against fanatical sectaries, I think it prudent to conciliate the political affections of so large a portion of our community as the Roman Catholics.”

We should like to know what Mr. John Wilson Croker would now say, after having found his hopes and anticipations so completely blasted—

after finding himself so thoroughly deceived by the fair speeches and specious promises of the Priests of Rome? Surely no individual should more heartily join in carrying out the judgment of Mr. Justice Blackstone, by whose sentiments he professed to have been guided, in his decisions and speeches in favour of the Roman Catholic claims—

“If, therefore, the case supposed by Blackstone should arise; if, from some unforeseen circumstances, the Catholics should again become dangerous to the Constitution, I hold that we should have the right—I am confident we should have the power—of again placing them under all necessary restrictions.”

He has heard it declared in the public assemblies of Roman Catholics, that the emancipation he advocated was not the emancipation sought by the leaders of the Roman Catholic party in the country—that with them emancipation was not the *end* but the *means*—that believing as a matter of faith the Romish Church to be “the only true church on earth”—it “would be again restored and established in Ireland, and the *heresy* which supplanted it extinguished for ever”—will he not now feel constrained to say, “the time has arrived when at least the Romish Priests and Prelates should be placed under necessary restrictions.” We have the power—we have the right—the Romish Priests are become “dangerous to the Constitution;” still all we would ask for is—that we may not, by our *continued support*, render them still more dangerous than they have been, and are at present.

From all the statements brought forward by the friends of the measure, it will be seen that the chief argument for the Grant consisted in the *expediency* of supplying a well-educated, loyal priesthood, for the Roman Catholics of the country—several members assuming that the ecclesiastical property formerly belonged to the Romish Church, and had been taken from it;* and that under such circumstances it was only fair in Government to allocate a certain sum for the education of young men intended for the Romish priesthood. Mr. Shiel, and some other members endeavoured, indeed, to shew that there had been a specific compact entered into at the time of the Union to support Maynooth. This argument was, however, proved to be utterly without foundation. It was distinctly denied by the Chancellor of the Exchequer (Mr. Perceval), and by several other members, that there ever was any understanding between Parliament and the Roman Catholics, that Maynooth was to be supported from the Government purse; and ultimately its friends could make no better argument than to shew that inasmuch as large sums had been voted to various Protestant Institutions, the Charter Schools, and the Society for Discountenancing Vice, &c., and as at the Union† an agreement had been entered into for

* For refutation of this assertion see Irish History in Appendix.

† The only clause in the act of union which could in any way be considered as relating to this grant, was that in the finance arrangements, the 7th section of the act, which is as follows:—

“ That a sum not less than the sums which have been granted by the Parliament of Ireland, on the average of six years preceding the 1st

support of a certain number of such establishments. Maynooth, considered as a benevolent institution, should be included. On this ground the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Foster, and others agreed to the Annual Grant of £8000, but opposed a larger sum. Even Lord John Russell admitted that supposing a compact had existed, still if Parliament had reason to think that they were doing that which was mischievous to the community, by continuing the Grant, or if the religious scruples of the community would not allow of the continuance of the Grant, there was nothing to prevent them from discontinuing it. On the whole, from all the facts adduced, in place of shewing that Maynooth had any particular claim over other charities, it has been made evident, it possessed no claim to any grant even equal to what the Charter Schools,* and others of a similar character enjoyed. As then, these grants have long since been withdrawn from the Protestant institutions, why not from the Roman Catholic establishment? Will it be said that this was the only institution which has any peculiar claim on the public funds of the country? that while the Protestant Institutions, which were established more than half a century

day of January, 1800, in premiums for the internal encouragement of agriculture and manufactures, or for the maintaining institutions for pious and charitable purposes, shall be applied, for the period of twenty years after the Union, to such local purposes in Ireland, in such manner as the parliament of the United Kingdom shall direct."

* The Charter Schools were founded in 1733, to prevent the spread of superstition, idolatry, and disaffection to the Protestant Government, and to train up the native Irish in the principles of religion and loyalty.

before Maynooth had any existence, have all been cut off, the Grant to Maynooth must be continued for more than thirty-two years beyond the stipulated time. Shall it be said that an institution which has not been found in one single particular to answer the purposes for which it was designed, is the only one to be continued? On the contrary, is it not evident that to withdraw the Grant from Maynooth would be only equitable and just.

As we have already said, the principal argument put forward by the friends of the measure, was the *expediency* of giving the priests of Rome a *home education*, in order to prevent them imbibing disloyal and revolutionary principles. Mr. Grattan, taking this view of the subject, observed that "foreign education could engender no great loyalty." "Keep the Roman Catholic priests at home," observed the honorable member, "and you will thereby promote allegiance—kept at home and taught to love his country, he must then revere its Government." Now, in reference to this statement, what are the facts. It was shewn distinctly that such had not been the case in a single instance. In fact several members of the House of Commons substantiated the very reverse; and after the experience of fifty years, it has been clearly demonstrated by the proceedings at the recent elections, that the priests of the present day are really more disloyal, and worse disposed towards the Government, than those formerly educated abroad.

In reference to the last measure proposed by

Sir Robert Peel—to incorporate the Trustees of Maynooth, and thereby make it a Government institution—it should here be stated, that it was carried by means of a monstrous coalition of parties, many of them induced to join in the scheme, by promises of measures of a very different character being introduced by the Premier. Petitions, signed by upwards of 1,200,000 names, against the measure, poured in from every quarter, and a highly respectable deputation waited upon him, to implore time for the country to express its views still more fully; but all to no purpose, for although Sir Robert admitted that the voice of the country was against him, still he was determined to carry the measure, and he did carry it. He endowed an establishment for teaching Popery; and, in consequence, lost the confidence of the nation—was forced to relinquish the reins of Government—just lived long enough to see, by sad experience, the evil effects resulting from acting in opposition to those Protestant principles, which at one time he professed to hold and cherish—and as his reward, carried with him to the grave the pity and the contempt of every true Protestant throughout her Majesty's dominions!!

It has been said, however, that in consequence of the arrangement entered into between Sir Robert Peel and the Roman Catholic laity in the year 1845, to give the sum of £27,000 per annum, it would be a breach of faith on behalf of the present Government, now, by any act of theirs, to vitiate

that arrangement. This we consider mere special pleading. There was nothing whatever given in lieu of the large sum voted—the engagements made on the part of the Romanists have not been fulfilled—the objects proposed have not been obtained; on the contrary, the Government has ever since been bearded by the very priests they educated and endeavoured to serve. The Grant to Maynooth was a donation to procure peace and quietness in the country—and has such been the result? We ask what has been the spirit manifested to the Government which offered such a boon towards procuring peace and tranquillity for the people? First, we had a rebellion, encouraged and fomented by the very men who had received their education in Maynooth, and some of whom had been professors in the institution—secondly, a visit from the Pope's legate or nuncio, by whose directions a synod was assembled at Thurles, for the purpose of denouncing and opposing the Government—thirdly, an assumption of titles contrary to the laws of the land—fourth, a Tenant League, in which the priests, with Dr. Cullen at their head, were the principal actors, and whose chief design is to abolish the rights of property, and to shake to its very foundation the present state of social life in those countries—fifth, a Romanist Defence Association,* to teach

* At the first General meeting of the Roman Catholic Defence Association, the speakers, in reference to the act which had just been passed in the British Parliament, having reference to the Papal aggression on England, emphatically declared their intention to "break the Law,"

and encourage the people how to break any laws which might be enacted relative to the suppression of Popish assumption—sixth, a practical demonstration of the power of the Romish priesthood to rouse the common people to deeds of violence and bloodshed during the elections, and to create insubordination amongst her Majesty's troops—and finally, the formation of a Society, under the title of the "Religious Equality Society," to train the members of Parliament, returned through priestly influence, in the best methods of opposing everything like law and order, and at the same time of fostering and forwarding the objects which the priests have in view, relative to bringing Ireland and England into the subjection of the See of Rome.

The gratitude felt by the Romanists of this country, for the large sums given annually for the support of Maynooth, will be seen from the following extract of an address to the "Roman Catholic Electors of Ireland," from the Defence Association, during the past year. Speaking of the Grant to Maynooth, it is said—

"This is not a grant made year by year, but a permanent endowment, given once for all by a former parliament, as the immense estates taken from the Church in these islands by sacrilegious kings were given by them to favourites. The parliament which made this gift well knew that their predecessors had robbed the Church of the Irish nation of

and advised others to do the same. And at a meeting held immediately afterwards on the same subject at Loughrea, where the priests were very numerous, the following resolution was passed :—

RESOLVED—"That a law, in terms directed against the free exercise of the Catholic religion, has no binding force, and, like all other penal enactments against the Church, ought to be disregarded."

the whole of its property—a property given to it by the piety of its own members.”*

But here we must not overlook a subject of paramount importance. It will be remembered that previous to the passing of the Emancipation Act, in 1829, one of the principal guarantees given to the Government for the allegiance and loyalty of the Romish Priests, consisted in the assumed fact that the Pope had nothing to do with the appointment of the Bishops in this country—that the Irish Church was independent of the Pope, except in so far as obtaining canonical institution. It will be seen that this was the point rested on by Sir Henry Parnell and others. That the very reverse is the case we have now the fullest evidence, in the appointment of Paul Cullen to the Primacy of Armagh, and afterwards as the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin—the said Paul Cullen having no other recommendation than that he was the nominee of the Pope ; and yet to make way for this man, the priests educated in Maynooth were overlooked and set aside, and in violation of the rules for the appointment of the Roman Catholic Bishops in Ireland, he, a stranger in the country, was appointed by the Pope to inculcate authority to the Papal power, and to introduce ultra-montane doctrines—to destroy the colleges established by the legislature, and maintained by the state—to extinguish the schools in which half-a-million of the poorer

* See in the “ Synopsis of Irish History,” in Appendix, a perfect refutation of this claim.

classes are educated—and to publish synodical addresses in which he attempts to set class against class—to represent every poor man as a martyr, and every rich man as a tyrant. Such being the case, we ask, therefore, what benefit, can there be in educating men to act under such foreign authority? and further, what has become of the guarantee so pressed upon the attention of Government at the time of the Emancipation Act? Is it not notorious that Paul Cullen refused to take the oath of allegiance? and shall the Pope still be permitted to appoint parties to high stations—who are in fact aliens in the country, and possess neither the rights nor privileges of British subjects—that they may enact laws, and anathematize those who may wish to support the authority of the Government?*

From the various debates, indeed, it was evident that the same game was played in 1825 and 1845 which was so successful in 1795—the terrors of what might take place in case of an invasion—by the Irish Roman Catholics joining with the invaders against the troops of Great Britain, was made to tell so powerfully in the argument, that even the late lamented noble Duke was induced to give it as his opinion that the wishes of the Roman Catholics of the country could not be resisted! Such being the case, that kind Providence which has ever appeared on behalf of Protestant Britain, has wonderfully changed the scene, and in place of the boasted *eight millions* of Romanists who were by Mr.

* On this point see note in Appendix.

O'Connell, time after time, held up *in terrorem* over the English Government, there are at this moment not one-half that number to be found in all Ireland ; while the Protestants, who were then said to be a mere fraction of the people, have, like the children of Israel, so increased, as very nearly to balance the number of Roman Catholics now remaining in the country.*

Thank Providence on this head there is now no ground of alarm—if such ever existed—as the Protestants of Ireland would be perfectly able to put down any attempt at rebellion which might be fomented by the Romish priests of the country. Indeed, since the periods referred to, things have very much altered in Ireland, as respects the Romish Church and people ; and if we are to credit the statements of their own registries and public journals, no necessity now exists for educating the Romish priesthood—they have at present several colleges of their own,† in which a sufficient number of students may now be educated, if they do not think proper to continue Maynooth on their own account,

* See extract from Professor Edgar's Essay, in Appendix.

† The following list of the Roman Catholic Colleges in Ireland, is taken from their own accredited "Ecclesiastical Register"—

Royal College of St. Patrick, Maynooth.

Clongowes Wood College, the principal institution of the Jesuits in Ireland.

St. Patrick's College, Carlow.

St. Vincent's Ecclesiastical College.

Catholic Missionary College of All-Hallows.

The College of St. Francis Xavier.

St. Kyran's College, Kilkenny.

Wexford College.

St. John's College, Waterford.

St. Jarlath's, Tuam.

Diocesan College of Atherry.

at their own expense ; besides which, large sums are being collected by the Romish Prelates in England, and even in foreign lands, for the establishment of a Roman Catholic college of large capabilities, to be conducted in the most approved fashion of the Roman Catholic exclusionists ; and to which it is now well known Dr. Newman has been already appointed President ; added to which, Trinity College, and the Queen's Colleges in the provinces, are now open to young men of the Romish persuasion ; so that there would be no necessity for their going abroad, while by a *united* education, what Mr. Grattan and other members considered a great advantage, would be gained*—Roman Catho-

St. Mary's College, Galway.

St. Patrick's College, Armagh.

The College of St. Agatha,* devoted entirely to the education of young men for the priesthood

In all these institutions young men are trained for the Romish priesthood, and from the Report of the Commissioners of Education Enquiry, it appears that from these sources one hundred and fifty priests are annually added to the number of priests in Ireland. Dr. Doyle, in his evidence, stated that in Clongowes alone there were one hundred and fifty students, each of whom had to pay fifty guineas per annum for his board and education.

* The following is the evidence of Dr. Doyle on this point, in 1825—

“Do you consider it desirable that the Roman Catholic laity should be educated conjointly with the Protestants?—I see no objection whatever that they should be educated together. On the contrary, if, by being educated together, the harmony of the different sects in Ireland could be promoted, I think that it would be a matter to be desired.

“If they were so educated together at Trinity College, Dublin, must they not have separate professors of their own faith to instruct the young men?—That would not be necessary for those who attend college, as many of those who enter there can lodge in town, and receive religious instruction where they please, and even those who reside within Trinity College have sufficient opportunities of obtaining religious instruction abroad on Sundays.

“In point of fact, are there not now some Roman Catholic students in Trinity College, Dublin?—I apprehend some hundreds of them. The Roman Catholics in Trinity College are not obliged to attend prayers

* For information relative to these Institutions, see *Ireland in 1846*, p. 25, by P.D. Hardy,

lics and Protestants might be, to a certain extent, educated together. From all these circumstances, therefore, it is quite evident, as we have said, that in the present day the same necessity does not exist, for an institution like Maynooth, that was pleaded when that institution was established. No doubt Mr. Shiel observed, in his speech, that "*four years spent in Trinity College would constitute a bad apprenticeship for the Confessional!!*"—that he was not anxious to see the sons of the gentry of Ireland in the Church." We leave these sentiments of "the great orator" for the calm consideration of the respectable Roman Catholics of Ireland.

But there is another point to which we must also more particularly refer—that the number of priests educated in Maynooth, is far beyond the actual requirements of the body in Ireland. From the statements in the Roman Catholic registries it appears there are at present in Ireland 2,361 priests, engaged in the regular chapel services, or as missionaries throughout the country, and taking into account the decrease in the Romish population, those would be amply sufficient. Now to keep up this number, not more than one hundred annually would

with others; and of course they would resort to the prayers of their own church, at least on Sundays. On other days of the week they might perform their devotions in their chambers."

The following is the testimony of Mr. O'Connell, in 1825—

"Do you think that a separate education for the Roman Catholic clergy would be an advisable thing to continue or not?—My own wish would be very much that the Catholic and Protestant clergy should be educated in the same university. I think it would be a most desirable thing, and I think it would be one of the consequences that would follow very shortly after emancipation."

be required ; and from the statements given by Dr. Doyle before the Parliamentary Committee, it will be seen these could be supplied from Carlow, Kilkenny, Waterford, and Wexford, which are all endowed colleges, and from which about one hundred and fifty are annually sent out educated as priests ; so far then as the people of Ireland are concerned, it is evident there is no necessity at all for Maynooth—but in reference to this subject, we would enquire what are the real facts of the case ? The statements made by Mr. O'Connell and the Editor of the *Tablet* will explain the matter. Mr. O'Connell observed—

“ The Irish priests are in great demand in ENGLAND ! they are very much in demand in all the United States. They are in demand in Canada ; in all the British Colonies : and even New South Wales is claiming a portion of them.”

In the *Tablet* of August 2nd, 1852, we are informed also, *that*

“ The main object of the college is to provide an efficient national clergy for Ireland. That she has happily succeeded, the zeal, piety, and uncompromising energy of the Irish priests is a sufficient proof. But, owing to circumstances special to some of the dioceses in Ireland, where, for instance, there might not be an immediate want of clergymen, Maynooth has, from the first year of her establishment down to the present, contributed her glorious contingent of priests and bishops to break the bread of life to those who yet sleep in the shadow of death ; and from the wild highlands of Scotland, and the more civilized shires of England herself, to the fertile pampas of the Andes, and the remotest bournes of China and Japan, the

faithful, generous Irish missionary may be found exercising the functions of his sacred ministry, and perpetuating the virtues and glories of the dear old fatherland."

Now we would ask the Protestants of England and Scotland will they say "content" to the payment of upwards of £30,000 per annum for the education of Romish priests to pervert their own people, or to go abroad as missionaries to China or Japan, or the fertile pampas of the Andes? We tell them the Protestants of Ireland feel very sore at the idea of being obliged to do so. They, as it will be seen from the foregoing, have from the very first exerted all their influence against the measure, and on England and Scotland rests the blame. This was made apparent in the speech of the Right Hon. John Foster, in the Irish House of Commons, as referred to in a preceding page (37).

That the Roman Catholic body are well able to pay for the education of their priests, is also evident from the large sums they raise for various purposes. In the *Tablet*, November 13, 1852, it is estimated that "the expense of the trial of *Achilli v. Newman*, which the latter would have to pay, is £10,000; and it is stated that of this sum £1000 had been received from France, £850 from Ireland, and that already between £6000 and £7000 had been collected for the purpose in England—that to make up this sum there was one subscription of £500, two of £300, several of £100, while others contributed in sums £30, £20, and £10." Surely, then, when such donations can be given for such a purpose, it is un-

fair to require that the Romish priests should be educated out of the public purse.*

That the experiment relative to Maynooth has proved to be the most unqualified instance of signal failure that could by possibility be conceived has been fully demonstrated. The Priests and Prelates have had for fifty-seven years the entire management of the institution in their own hands. If the Tory Government were not as friendly as they could have wished—under Whig and Radical administrations they got every matter arranged to their heart's content—they were admitted to the vice-regal table—their every wish was attended to†—all complaints against them, even for joining in the recent rebellion, were quashed, and they themselves left unpunished; and yet what has been the result?

* In a Report of the National Association in 1840, and signed by Daniel O'Connell, as Chairman, the following are given as the amounts expended in Dublin within twenty years, in the erection of ecclesiastical buildings—

Marlborough-street Chapel	.	.	.	43,000
St. Andrews, Westland-row	.	.	.	21,000
St. Paul's, Arran quay	.	.	.	12,000
St. Michan's	.	.	.	8,000
SS. Michael and John's	.	.	.	6,000
St. Catherine's	.	.	.	7,000
St. Nicholas'	.	.	.	6,000
St. Francis Xavier	.	.	.	8,000
Improvements in other churches	.	.	.	10,000
Churches, &c. of Augustines and other orders, stated to be much below the real value	.	.	.	20,000
Five Convents, Sisters of Charity	.	.	.	15,000
Three do. Carmelite nuns	.	.	.	9,000
Convent of Poor Clares, of Dominican nuns, and Presentation	.	.	.	9,000
				<hr/>
				£174,000

By the Catholic Register, p. 406, we learn that the amount annually contributed by the Irish to the Propaganda at Rome, is between £800 and £1000.

† See Letter of Lord Clarendon, in Appendix.

let the scenes during the recent elections testify—they are at this moment worse than ever they were; more turbulent, more violent, and if possible more disloyal; while Maynooth continues to be the hot-bed of sedition, and a school for the inculcation and dissemination of the worst species of ultra-mon-tane principles.

With the preceding observations we feel we might have closed our case against Maynooth. However, lest any individual should still be unaware of the doctrines and principles inculcated on the minds of the students in that institution, we deem it expedient to lay before them a brief specimen of the *moral* instruction afforded to those by whom the minds of the Roman Catholic population of Ireland are hereafter to be formed; and this we now have the means of ascertaining with tolerable correctness, from the evidence adduced before the Commission of Inquiry, ordered by Parliament in 1825; for although the course of education in Maynooth may be more extensive, the education itself is the same in kind that it ever was, and must continue to be so whilst the dogmas of the church of Rome are the authorized doctrines of the institution.

It is not, indeed, our intention at the present to go into those more filthy scenes of the Confessional, with which, from having been so frequently brought under notice, the public are unfortunately but too

well acquainted. We shall refer merely to that portion of the student's education which is especially designed to fit him for afterwards forming the moral habits of the people committed to his care, especially in so far as they relate to the obligations existing between man and man in social life—and in considering this portion of our subject, we shall refer simply to two of the class books used in Maynooth as guides in religion and morals—Bailly and Delahogue.*

In a former page (70), we have given from those class books, specimens of the way in which the students are instructed how they may break an oath or tell a falsehood, when circumstances require it ; and how allegiance to the British throne is not only considered unnecessary, but that its violation is rendered requisite when it comes in opposition to their allegiance to the Pope or the Church.

And here, in calling attention to the *Morality* taught in Maynooth, we shall confine our observations to the principles of *common honesty* inculcated by the professors. In one of the class books, that of Professor Delahogue, it is laid down, that a certain, or rather an uncertain amount, must be stolen from an individual to constitute the theft a mortal sin. In calculating this amount,

* It may be necessary to mention, that Dr. Delahogue, was appointed Professor of Theology to the College of Maynooth soon after its institution, and the publication from which the extracts are selected is "the *class book*" of the students destined for holy orders. The class book by Bailly was the subject of a prosecution by Napoleon, and was prohibited on account of its revolutionary tendency.

Bailly rules that the rank of the respective parties must be taken into the account ; that more may be lawfully stolen from a rich than from a poor man. He divides mankind into four classes—

“The first rank consists of the nobles who live in splendour—the second, of those who live on their own estates, but not so splendidly—the third, of artisans who support themselves by their own labour—and the fourth, of the poor who live by begging, It is commonly laid down, and may be considered as determined, that, to constitute a mortal sin of theft, with respect to persons of the first class, fifty or sixty pence is sufficient.....with respect to the third, twenty pence, or, if their trade be less lucrative, ten-pence—and when stolen from the last class, the paupers, four pence is enough ; or even one penny, *i. e.* (oh, kind-hearted calculator !) if—they have nothing else to live on !”

If, then, a person should have a desire to know how much a servant may safely steal from his master, or a wife from her husband, these learned divines and calculating moralists, will supply him with ample details,* and he may also learn under what circumstances restitution of stolen goods may be dispensed with!! Dr. Delahogue will inform him that in reference to plundered goods,

“If any property of considerable value has been obtained by means of small thefts, and restitution cannot be made to each individual, either because those individuals are unknown, or because the doing of this is more difficult, or because there is a risk of disgrace, then the stolen property is to be given to the poor, or applied to some good work, (*i. e.* given to the church) !”†

And yet will it be believed, that the books from which these extracts are taken, are the class books of Maynooth, sanctioned by the Government, and still used in the institution ; indeed Mr. Anglade,

* See Bailie's Treatise on the Decalogue, pp. 238—240.

† Ibid, p. 236. See also the Confessional ; or the System of Theology taught in the College of Maynooth, by P. D. Hardy, p. 39.

the Professor of Moral Theology at Maynooth, tells us, these are

“The treatises of divinity which are most essential” in the education of priests “for the discharge of their duty in the ministry;”—we find also these are the studies to which, according to Mr. Browne’s testimony (the Professor of Sacred Scripture and Hebrew,) “nine hours in class and about forty-eight hours in preparation,” are devoted in every week spent at Maynooth.

“Our object has been (says Mr. Anglade,) seeing the want of clergy, to choose among the treatises of divinity those which are most essential to them for the discharge of their duty in the ministry, as they have no other occasion of improving themselves, except by reading books: and so the treatises I have taught are relating to human acts, conscience, sins, sacraments, penance, in ALL its parts, MARRIAGE, RESTITUTION, CONTRACTS, laws, censures, irregularities.”*

Nay, more, he says of Bailly, if there is any thing that is called lax principles of morality, I am sure Bailly is free from it.

To go at length into the various religious tenets into which the Maynooth students are indoctrinated, would lead us far beyond our proposed limits—from the notes appended, and from articles in the Appendix, the reader will be able to see that doctrines frequently repudiated by the Romish divines of this country, are now held and taught by the Pope, the Cardinals, and the Prelates of the Romish Church.†

* See Irish Education Report, VII. App. pp. 152, 155, 177.

† For years it was denied by the Controversialists on the side of Rome that prayers were offered to the Virgin Mary or the Saints, by the command of the Church. This, it now appears, was a mere delusion, to save themselves from the charge of idolatrous worship. By the following extract it will be seen, that the present Pope, in a recent Encyclical, and Paul Cullen, in a Pastoral circulated during the past month, both invoke the Virgin and the Saints, and call upon all their followers to do the same.

In the Encyclical Letter of Pius IX. ordering a Jubilee, published during the present year is the following advice;—

“And that God may be made more accessible, and give ear to our

From the examination of the learned Professors and others, it appeared distinctly that with the Church of Rome ignorance is the mother of devotion ; that the

prayers, and hear our petitions, let us raise our hearts and hands to His most holy Mother, the Immaculate Virgin Mary. We could not find protection more powerful or more effectual with God. She is to us the most tender of Mothers, our firmest reliance, and the very spring of our hopes. since she asks nothing which she does not obtain, and her prayer is never refused Let us also *implore*, especially, the intercession of the Prince of the Apostles, to whom Jesus Christ Himself has given the keys of the kingdom of Heaven—whom He has established as the foundation of His Church, against which the gates of Hell will not be able to prevail. Let us then *pray* to Paul, the companion of His Apostleship. Let us *pray* to the patron of each city and country, and to all the blessed that our most merciful Lord may shed upon us in abundance and munificence the gifts of His bounty.

(Signed) “PIUS IX, POPE.”

In the conclusion of Paul Cullen’s Epistle, having reference to the foregoing, and to which he signs himself Archbishop, he says:—

“ Cherish and protect, O immaculate Virgin, thy blessed children, who sustain and adorn our religious and charitable institutions, emulating thy unwordly purity and sanctity, thy chastity and self-sacrifice, and diffusing on every side the sweet odours of Jesus Christ. Look down, O health of the weak, with compassionate tenderness on the young.
* * * And, O refuge of sinners ! we implore thee with all the fervour of our souls on this day of grace and benediction to turn thine eyes of mercy on those poor wanderers, who are straying from the fold.
* * * And, oh ! mercifully grant to their unworthy prelate, one of the greatest of thy favours—a joy far superior to that which he experiences from the fervour of the just—the unspeakable consolation of pressing them to his bosom, and placing them once more in the security of the fold they had deserted.

(Signed) PAUL CULLEN, ARCHBISHOP.”

If this be not encouraging idolatrous worship, let it be said what is ?

“ As the practice in Maynooth, with regard to the Virgin Mary, has been adverted to, I beg leave also to mention, that the *Host* is carried about there with great form and ceremony, on the same festivals as it is in Roman Catholic countries ; and upon those occasions many of the inmates not only kneel, but prostrate themselves, in the most reverential manner, on the ground. The evening before the day upon which this ceremony takes place, the host is generally consecrated ; and it may not be uninteresting to some to mention, that from the time of its consecration, to the commencement of the procession, next day, the flour and water *lies in great state ! !* and two of the students, dressed in white surplices, and on their knees before it, are placed to watch it ; and lest weariness should break in upon their vigilance, they are relieved every hour by two more, from a number kept in waiting for that purpose. When one thinks of the imposing solemnity which is thrown round this

students are especially ignorant of the book of God* and its divine principles and precepts ; that in fact she has no authorized version of the Bible ; no uniform vernacular catechism ; no authorized commentary ; while her Breviary, which her priests are directed to read daily, under pain of mortal sin, we are told by Dr. Crotty, is not to be relied upon as a rule of faith or practice. It would appear, indeed, that the greatest doubt and uncertainty hangs over the entire constitution of the Roman Catholic religion, both as regards doctrine and discipline.

Surely comment is unnecessary on the effect which such instruction must have on the character and conduct of the students, and on those into whose minds they afterwards infuse similar errors ; in reference to the Inquiry before the Commissioners, it may be sufficient to say, that after a lengthened investigation into the education given in Maynooth, the books, the tenets, oaths and other obligations, the papal authority, the power of dispensations—the result was what was naturally to be expected—*just nothing* ; the Protean character of Popery met every change ; and principles which had been avowed, acted on, and gloried in, were denied

business, perhaps it is impossible for the mind to conceive of any thing more deeply idolatrous or more artfully designed, to lead the mind away from the simple and genuine worship of the one living and true God.”—*Triamoria*, p. 94.—Great complaints have recently been made by Protestants that during the past year the Host has been carried “in state” round the outside of chapels ; and passers-by obliged to take off their hats, in reverence !!

* For a specimen of their perfect ignorance of the Scriptures, which they call “the Devil’s book,” see Appendix.]

with as steady a countenance, or excused with as unblushing an ingenuity, as if popes had not claimed temporal authority, or laymen and ecclesiastics had never admitted it.*

On the whole, therefore, it must appear plain to any one investigating the matter, that it would be perfectly impossible, under such circumstances, for a Protestant Government to arrive at any certainty as to the principles or practices inculcated by the Professors in Maynooth; and it certainly follows, as a natural inference, that the Government of the

* The tergiversation and evasion practised by the Professors of Maynooth, during their examination by the Commissioners, could not fail to impress any reasoning mind that neither the Prelates or Professors were stating the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth. The President himself swearing he believed the doctrine of the *Pope's infallibility* was taught in certain books he had not read. He thought it was not an article of faith, that the Pope is infallible, although as a probable opinion, he and all his college with him, may believe it. Further on, in his examination, Dr. Crotty, the *Professor* of Canon Law in Maynooth solemnly swore that he did not know whether a single bishop in Ireland holds the affirmative or negative proposition as to the infallibility of the Pope—that not even in consecration had any of them ever declared their sentiments. This same Professor, although Lecturer to the Dunboyne students, declared on his oath he was not able to state what opinions any of those students held—that for aught he knew, all might be *ultra-montane* in the highest degree. During the examination it appeared that on the texts urged for and against the Pope's infallibility, such as "*Tu es Petrus*," two learned divines of the church held widely opposite opinions, Dr. Doyle contending that it merely meant his *supremacy*, while Dr. Slevin adduced it to prove his *infallibility*!! It was laid down, indeed, as a settled point, that he derived his authority immediately from God, without the concurrence of the church. Dr. M'Hale, in his examination, on being questioned as to the Bull of 1741, which excommunicated all persons who might bring a Roman Catholic priest before a lay tribunal—replied, that Bull *probably* was never published in this country, and therefore we have nothing to do with its contents!!

country should not have anything to do with such an institution.

Dispassionately considering the entire bearing and influence of the instructions given to the students in the institution, there can be no doubt whatever that the doctrines which they are taught, and which they afterwards, as priests, communicate to the people, have been the cause of the hitherto degraded state of Ireland—in fact, that the instructions given by the priests to the people have produced the disgraceful state of things apparent in those parts of the country over which their influence extends.*

We said in a preceding page, that it was not our intention to go into the consideration of those abominations of the Confessional, which relate to the obscenities and impurities of the priesthood in reference to females; nor shall we do so, further than to remark, that after the priests of Rome having for upwards of fifty years, with their usual disregard of truth, denied that the young men in Maynooth were instructed in those portions of Dens,

* At a public meeting held in Dublin during the year 1845, it was stated, and offered to be proved, by two clergymen who had been educated in Maynooth, that seditious songs are sung, and seditious sentiments encouraged by and among the students in the institution—that when, on the occasion of a *liberal* Lord Lieutenant visiting the college, a dinner and wine were given to the students, on Mr. O'Connell's health being drank, the most violent political language was used, together with the most unwarrantable abuse of Protestantism, one of the Professors in the course of his speech having laid it down as a maxim not contrary to any laws human or divine, that “while we should love those who do us good, we are at perfect liberty to hate those who injure us.”—*Ireland in 1846*, by P. D. Hardy, p. 40.

and Bailly, and Delahogue, having particular reference to what has been emphatically described as "*the abominations of the Confessional*;" having denied before the Commission of Inquiry that such matters formed a part of the education of the young men in Maynooth—now, in the year 1852, their avowedly authorised advocate, the Editor of the *Tablet*, has with the most unblushing effrontery, admitted that the contrary is the fact. In that journal of last August 14, the Editor in a lengthened article on Maynooth, observes—

"In the question of the alleged impurity of certain treatises with which the priesthood must be acquainted, it presents no difficulty to a Catholic, but to an educated and even honest and devout Protestant, it is scarcely possible to present a satisfactory explanation.

"We admit at once that the priesthood must be taught things which are *unfit for the knowledge of women or of men!* that they have books, and that they must read them, wholly unfit for circulation among young people. These books, however, are not written in the vernacular language of any country, and a very small part of them is occupied with the subject in question. But, nevertheless, the books exist, and must exist, so long as sin shall be in the world, and a priesthood to deal with it. These books are not written for amusement, or recreation, or for improper purposes, but are the result of stern necessity, and of the wickedness of men in general. Their purpose is not to teach men how to sin, but to teach the priest how to discriminate between sin and sin—how to terrify the hardy criminal, and if need be, to comfort the scrupulous, and bring an erroneous conscience to the light of justice.

"We will also admit everything that the Protestant can

say against certain treatises of Moral Theology!! except that they are written for an evil end, or that they are erroneous, and meet him willingly on the low ground which he has chosen. Let these books be bad, full of language which cannot be spoken; let them be, as they are said to be, unfit for man's reading, and unbecoming a circulating library. We admit it all, and much more, and probably a Catholic has a keener sense than the Protestant that these books are ill adapted for general circulation, or popular reading. We certainly do not publish extracts from them, nor call public attention to them—we hide them as much as we can from the eyes of all, and permit their use only to those who are, by the obligations of their office, bound to know them."

Here, then, we have a full and perfect admission of a fact which was over and over again denied by the Professors of Maynooth, and by the Romish Priests and Prelates generally; even the late Dr. Murray having endeavoured to get out of the publication of Dens, by throwing the onus of the printing of 3000 copies of the work, and of giving them to the students in Maynooth, on his unfortunate publisher, Mr. Coyne—and now, how does the Maynooth apologist endeavour to get out of the scandal? by arguing for its propriety, on the ground, forsooth, that as doctors have to learn certain books that are not fitted for the public eye, it is right that the priests trained in Maynooth should be instructed in the vile books which enable them to ask questions of young females, and widows, and of the wives of the gentry and poor of the land, in the Confessional, which should never be known to, or

thought of, by man or woman, and which should never be mentioned in the hearing of any modest female.* In proof of this, let the reader who may wish to be informed on the subject, look at a few of the more modest and delicate questions given in "The Confessional, or the System of Theology taught at Maynooth," a new edition of which we have recently published, and no one charge in which the priests have ever been able to upset, although some of them have more than once attempted so to do—and then let the reader say, should the priests of Rome be allowed thus to whisper in the Confessional, what it is a crime, or to say the least of it, a disgrace, for any man or woman to utter in public?

The fruits of the instruction given to the students in Maynooth, and afterwards by them to the peasantry, became more and more evident, year after year. The common people, instructed in the moral mysteries of their religion—how they might cheat or defraud their employers or neighbours, or steal from strangers, without committing mortal sin; how they might swear falsely, and yet be guiltless; and finding out, from their manuals and books of devotion, that in various in-

* Mark, reader, "the examiners in this detestable investigation, are unmarried men, generally young—aye, and unmarried, not from any conscientious motive or wish of their own, but as a qualification for the office which they hold—men, too, almost universally of the lowest classes, who seek that office only because their poverty holds out no other hope for fortune or fame—men whose passions have never been subjected to the wholesome influence of educated society;—and, I ask, could human ingenuity invent a more effective moral 'infernal machine.'"

stances, where the honour of the church was concerned, in place of being sinful, it was even *meritorious to murder Protestants* who opposed their religion—as a necessary consequence, one rebellion followed after another, in quick succession, in which the destruction of Protestants was the great inducement for risking life or limb. In each of these rebellions a number of the priests were deeply implicated, having taken an active and prominent part in the most stirring scenes of bloodshed and cruelty ;* while it was also well known that the prelates from behind the scenes directed the various movements of attack or defence, as best suited their purpose.† But not to refer to rebellions, have we not every day before our eyes, in the public journals, deeds of atrocity committed by order of the priests, on poor unoffending Protestants, merely because they are such.‡ Therefore, taking these various facts into

* Need we refer to the doings of the priests at Scullabogue, or the bridge of Wexford.

† Hear the character given of the Romish Priests and Prelates from one of themselves, the celebrated Dr. O'Connor—speaking of the rebellion of 1641, he says—

“When he finds that the famous rebellion of 1641, was planned in the dark, by those who claim a superior right to judge and decide in secret Synods, on all matters touching faith and discipline, by men who taught that a Papal excommunication, however unjust, must be obeyed ; and that this was the grand lever of the whole rebellion, and of all the perjuries and violations of public faith which have marked their characters with such indelible disgrace, he thinks it a duty which he owes to his country, after having read so much of its history as I have, to state fairly who these incendiaries were, and by whose persuasions the rabble were stimulated to such unparalleled atrocities. Never was more disloyal and treacherous conduct masked with more loyal professions—never were more crooked designs against the independence of our country, attended with more perjured, and yet holy intrigues, for subjecting us to a foreign yoke.”

‡ For proof we refer to the “sayings and doings of the priests” in our Appendix.

consideration, we ask, would it not be most extraordinary were Ireland at this moment to present any other appearance than it does. Looking at the description of characters the Romish priests of Ireland really are—the education they themselves receive in Maynooth, with the nature of their religion, and the code of morals in which they are instructed; and considering at the same time the power they have obtained over the people of the country, by their assumption of spiritual authority, and by keeping them bound down in ignorance and superstition, the wonder would be, did Ireland present any other aspect than it now does. In reference to this subject, it has been justly observed,

“That if England, even with all its present superiority and advantage, had as many popish clergy in proportion, scattered over the face of it as Ireland has, with any thing approaching to similar means for their operation, she would soon descend from her present eminence, and sink into moral and political degradation; and the reason is clear; any system which destroys freedom of judgment and will, and brings men under an abject subjection to superstition and ignorance, in the natural progress of cause and effect, must produce this result.”

And in passing, we would say, let England take the hint, and remember it is for her “*regeneration*” by far the greater number of priests at present being educated in Maynooth are preparing.

Under the various circumstances referred to, therefore we would ask, is it surprising that with such ideas, and such principles transfused into the minds of the lower orders of the people, *they*

should exhibit their present degraded aspect. Is it surprising, that under the tuition of the priests—they themselves trained as they have been—the poor, ignorant peasantry should have exhibited the ferocity and savage barbarity which characterised their excesses throughout the country during the recent Elections? Is it surprising to see the common people so acting, when we find those who should be foremost “in every good word and work,” shewing them the very opposite example; when we see the priests and prelates continually in the foreground of every contest, religious and political—urging on their unfortunate dupes, to deeds of strife and crime, and bloodshed. Do not the priests boast that they have the power to put down illegal associations, and prevent midnight murders; and yet we ask, have they ever exercised their authority in this way? When the sobriety and decorum which was manifested at the Clare Election, in 1828, in obedience to their mandate, under the guidance of Mr. O’Connell, is recollected—when a people who had always been accustomed on such occasions to give themselves up to all manner of dissipation, are seen at once, for an illegal purpose, and the better to promote the work of the priests, to become sober and quiet, and ready at a moment’s notice to do the priest’s bidding—can it be doubted for an instant that those reverend gentlemen have actually the power they boast of; but we ask has that power ever been exerted in the cause of truth and justice—to prevent murder, or to still the rage and

violence of the people? Have the priests ever refused to absolve those who were members of the Ribbon Society, and who were guilty of murder and other heinous crimes? We answer *No!* and we defy an instance of such righteous interference to be produced. On the contrary, we affirm that nine-tenths of the midnight murders, and broad daylight assassinations might be traced to the unhallowed, demoralizing teachings, given to the unfortunate people in the Mass House, and in the Confessional.* We repeat our query—has there, during the last fifty years, been one solitary instance of a Priest having been the means of bringing a criminal to justice? On the contrary, have not the priests been *participes criminis*—inasmuch as being aware of the murders and the murderers, they have never in a single instance given up the parties to justice.

In conclusion, we would observe, that however schoolmen may argue about the nature and the power of the church, it is quite clear the poor ignorant Irish peasant knows nothing of such subtleties—his priest is to him *as his God*—and when he

* *De Thou*, himself a Roman Catholic, thus describes the system pursued by the priests:—

“They who worked the most efficaciously to cause rebellion were the confessors, who developed, in the ears of their penitents, whatever the preachers durst not plainly set forth in public; for, in their pulpits they refrained from naming persons, fearing they might be punished. The confessors, making an abuse of the secrecy of their ministry, searched into the secrets of families: they maintained that subjects might form associations without the permission of the prince; they dragged them into that fatal league, and they refused absolution to such as would not enter; and laid down this new dogma, ‘that the penitent who betrays what the confessor has told him is as guilty as the confessor who reveals the confession of his penitent.’”—*De Thou Hist. Lib.* 86.

hears his *priest* speak, he considers it as the immutable decree of the *church*, whose decrees he has been taught to obey, under the penalty of punishment in this life and in the world to come ; and when the poor peasant observes that certain offences—such as reading a Bible, or going to a Bible school—are invariably marked out as heinous sins and crimes committed against the church, while other acts of a really guilty character are passed over unnoticed, or at most by a slight punishment, he is naturally led to think lightly of the one, and to dread the commission of the other ; and from not being taught to regard sin, as *sin*—to hate it on account of its being a breach of God's holy law—is it wonderful that the Irish peasant should be remarkable for a neglect of the laws of God, and a contempt for the laws of the land—is it surprising that when left to his own imaginings and to the erroneous teachings of his spiritual director, to make up his mind as to what is a *venial* and what a *mortal* sin—or which is the mortal sin from which he can be absolved by his priest for a certain *quid pro quo*, or what the sin that cannot be forgiven—we ask is it surprising that the ignorant peasant should by degrees become hardened in guilt, and eventually think but lightly of committing the most atrocious crimes ? We ask is not this a natural transition ? and is it not self-evident that the instructions of the priest, given in conformity with what he himself has learned in Maynooth, are calculated to produce this result ? nay more, in this way, to the system practised in

Maynooth, may we not trace the various atrocities which have for years disgraced those portions of the country where Popery prevails? May we not also to this source trace that bane of the country's prosperity, the *absenteeism* of the Irish landlords? For instance, how can it be expected that a Protestant landlord will reside in Ireland, where he must hold his comfort and his influence at the hand of a Popish priest! and who, unless his various plans of benevolence be completely in keeping with the preconceived plans of the priest, is, even in his endeavour to do good, met with repulsion and opposition. While all that he does is in strict accordance with the views entertained by the priest, he may get on well enough; but let him, or his wife, or his daughters, but once presume to give away a Bible or Testament to a child of a tenant, or to establish an industrial school in which the Bible is read, from that moment he is a marked man, and at once denounced from the altar, and held up to the ignorant people as a heretic, and an enemy to their religion—from that moment his life and property are unsafe, and he is completely at the mercy of the midnight assassin or incendiary. In the Confessional the priest is made acquainted with the most trivial matters that take place in every gentleman's family, by means of his servants and dependants, and from the Confessional issues his instructions; and as the confessional of the priest is higher than the tribunal of the judge, or the throne of the

sovereign, let but the word be spoken there, and the landlord is a doomed man.

But it may be said this is arguing the question on a *petitio principii*—taking it for granted that such things do take place. Unfortunately for Ireland such matters are not of rare occurrence—that many an excellent Protestant landlord has sold off all his property, and left the country on account of being placed in such circumstances, is but too well known to those who have remained behind. The spiritual despotism which is thus wielded over an ignorant and degraded people can only be known to those who reside in the country. To prove the correctness of our position to the most incredulous, we have put a very simple case, and asked how is it that the priests of Ireland, knowing every thing that takes place in the country, and what from time to time is to take place, never have exerted their powers to put down those illegal combinations which have caused such numerous murders, and have frightened away so many of the landlords, and made them exiles for life? how is it that after the most atrocious murders, they never have been the means of bringing the guilty parties to justice? We have shewn that in no one case has this ever been done, and we say the fearful consequence—the blood of those murdered persons—rests upon the heads of the Irish priesthood—equally with the lesser crime of producing so many absentees.

And here we would also ask, what is it that causes

the difference so apparent in different portions of Ireland—the north and the south—and which at once strikes every stranger visiting the country? Why is it that the people in the former are comparatively prosperous, comfortable, and happy; while the latter are poverty-stricken, and in the most abject state of wretchedness? It is simply their *religion*. The one is the result of Protestant principle, the other, as might be expected, the effects of Popish doctrines, inculcated by the priests educated in Maynooth. In one part of our country life and property is secure; in the other few Protestants who value their principles or their religion, can be induced to reside for any length of time.*

* By the Census of 1851, it appears that the proportion of the population of each province that could neither read nor write were—Ulster, 33 per cent., Leinster, 38, Munster, 52, Connaught, 64. The return of the Commissioners of National Education corroborates these facts. In the counties, the proportions who could neither read nor write were—Antrim, 23 per cent., Down, 27, Derry, 29; Kerry, 72, Galway, 78, and Mayo 80. Thus in the most Roman Catholic counties we have *four-fifths* of the people in total ignorance, in the most Protestant only *one-fifth*—while in all these counties those who can neither read nor write are almost all Roman Catholics.

The population of Great Britain was, in 1850, about three times that of Ireland. In that year 33,326 persons were committed in Ireland, and in the same year the number committed in Great Britain, out of a population three times as large, only amounted to 32,281, leaving a balance against us of nearly three to one—of those 33,326 committals in 1850, the number in Ulster was 5,260, not one sixth part. And of 23 executions in 1849 and 1850, only two occurred in Ulster.

In a little work recently published by the Rev. Dr. Dill, and which we would particularly recommend to the reader, this subject is treated at length, and from the statistics of crime it is made evident that as Popery prevails crime increases, and must increase. An excellent article on the subject also appeared in the Dublin University Magazine for September last—Extracts will be found in our Appendix.

It has been well observed by the highly respectable periodical referred to, that while a pure religion is the greatest of blessings, an impure and immoral one is an equally great curse. Look at Ireland—wherever Popery prevails, crime and wretchedness and misery are the attendants. Look to Tipperary, where Popery has its stronghold—where the Romish altars resound with awful denunciations, and we see man set against his fellow-man; while if we turn towards the north, we find amongst the Protestant peasantry peace and plenty.

And shall such a state of things be allowed to continue? Shall assistance be given to educate men, who, after they are educated, are the means of doing so much mischief in the country? Shall a grant be continued to a seminary in which is taught principles so subversive of all order and good feeling amongst the inhabitants of the land? Will there be found a Protestant member in the British House of Commons to argue for its support? They have the matter fairly placed before them—let the Government inquire into the truth of the facts here brought forward; and let no feeling of "*expediency*," no fear of offending the priests or prelates—no danger in case of an invasion, as likely to result from their future doings or teachings—lead a single member to forego his principles. The priests have done their worst; they have excited the people to rebellion time after time—they have shaken hands with the enemies of their country; and, this moment give them all that they ask—still they would,

after all, to-morrow side with either France or America against England—such is the antipathy of the Priests of Rome to its people and its religion.

Should any reader still be so uninformed on the subject, as to inquire, what object the priests of Rome could have in acting and speaking as we have represented them to do? we would refer to the following extract of a speech delivered on the 15th of April, 1847, in the House of Commons, by one whose testimony may be depended on as being well informed as to the designs and objects which the Church of Rome has in view in all her proceedings in reference to Protestants.

The Earl of Arundel, on a motion for going into Committee on the Roman Catholic Relief Bill, observed—

“The Church of Rome had been accused by many honorable members of persecution. He was not prepared to deny the imputation. (Hear, hear.) He admitted that on many occasions members of that church had been guilty of acts of persecution; but he might mention that each of those acts was to be estimated according to the temper and spirit of the time. (Hear, hear.) He might point to the Old Testament as containing much that might appear to authorize the persecution and extinction of unhallowed creeds. He alluded, of course, to the wars of the Israelites, and the extermination, by the chosen people, of the nations whom they encountered in their progress to the promised land. His honorable friend who had just sat down, had said that the Church of Rome was antagonistic to Protestantism. He perfectly agreed with him, and as long as the world lasted it would continue so, until Protestantism was extinct!!! (Cheers and counter-cheers.) The

struggle for religious freedom must go on ; but in that struggle he was not inclined to relinquish one iota of the claims of his Church."

Here it will be seen that the *object* Romanists have really in view is "the EXTINCTION OF PROTESTANTISM,"—that nothing less will satisfy them ; and that until this is gained, their most moderate men will not relinquish "one iota of the claims of the Romish Church." We ask, then, are the Protestants of Great Britain prepared to assist the advocates and priests of Rome to effect such a consummation? We ask Lord Palmerston and the present Ministry, are they prepared to assist the Earl of Arundel and his party, by educating priests for their purpose? and if they disclaim the idea or intention, we call upon them to prove their sincerity by withdrawing the Grant from Maynooth.

Had the Government thirty years since taken this advice, Ireland would at this moment have been in a very different condition. As a step in the right direction, let the supplies to Maynooth be at once cut off ; let there be no more dallying with Popery ; let the English Government throw the Priests of Rome on their own resources ; let *them* get up the college for which they have been for some years past been collecting funds ; let the Priests and Bishops be made amenable to the law ; and when they utter treason, as they have more than once done heretofore, let them be prosecuted for it. Let there be nothing done that would interfere with their religious liberty ; let the Legislature but keep the poor

people of the country firm in the conviction of justice and protection, and very soon, by the blessing of God, the Bible and the schoolmaster will be found too powerful for the priests and their principles.*

Let the Ministry now in power remember that at the period of the Reformation, our forefathers solemnly renounced for themselves, their children, and their children's children, Popery, with all its incumbrances, priests and friars, penances and purgatories—never again to be recognized, or supported by the funds of the nation—that it was in the faith of this that the present line of English monarchs took the throne—and this, they, and whatever Government they may call around them, are solemnly engaged to perpetuate. Let us hope that to sustain those great principles, which our forefathers sealed to us in all their integrity, with their best heart's blood, the Protestants of England will unite as one man—let us hope, that Lord Derby and every member of the late Cabinet, even while out of office, will in the maintenance of these principles consider no sacrifice too great, no exertion too arduous—but that, ‘setting their faces as a

* “Protestants are pretty generally in a position to protect themselves, and Irish Protestants are not men of a temper to shrink from the duty of self-defence; but the condition of the peaceable and well disposed Roman Catholics in Ireland is a condition of utter helplessness. The priest surrounded as he is always sure to surround himself with a band of the most ignorant and savage of the population, is a despot over the Roman Catholics of his parish, as absolute as any African chief, and this is the history of the half-hundred of priests' nominees sent to enlighten the legislature of the British Empire.”—*Standard*.

flint' against the designs of every enemy to the great principles of the British Constitution, and the great principles of the Reformation, they will maintain a straight-forward course—assured that they will be sustained by every man throughout Great Britain whose support is really valuable,* and above all, by the assistance of One, who can make even “his enemies to praise him.”

And now, having, we trust, made it plain to the mind of every true-hearted Protestant, that the Grant to Maynooth should not be continued, let us hope that a general cry will be raised from one end of the country to the other—“down with Maynooth—it is the bane of Ireland’s prosperity.”

* During the recent election for the City of Dublin, some of the members of Messrs. Grogan and Vance’s Committee, having suggested the propriety of these gentlemen abstaining from saying any thing in their addresses relative to Maynooth or the Education question, lest they might thereby lose some votes promised by liberal electors of the city; the suggestion was fully considered, and it was agreed, without a dissentient voice, that the learned gentlemen should be advised frankly and boldly to avow their sentiments on these points. They did so, and the result proved the value of adhering to principle—never were two members returned with a more triumphant majority, or under more cheering circumstances. Let Lord Derby and his adherents pursue a similar course, and they will find the result the same—the Protestants of England and Ireland will be with them, and but a few months will elapse until they will be replaced in a much more commanding position in the British Senate than they recently occupied.

A D D E N D A .

“SAYINGS AND DOINGS” OF THE ROMISH PRIESTS DURING THE RECENT ELECTIONS.

As a practical commentary on the foregoing statements and arguments, the following epitome of the “Sayings and Doings of the Romish Priests,” during the recent elections, must be read with interest—and surely if such are the fruits of the education given in Maynooth, no other argument should be deemed necessary to induce even “a Liberal Conservative Government” at once to withdraw the Grant from that nursery of sedition and crime. The facts stated are, however, a mere sample or specimen of what actually took place during the elections, under the direction of the priests of Rome educated in Maynooth. To detail the entire of their Sayings and Doings during the period referred to, would occupy an entire volume. To the authorities quoted at the commencement of the several debates, we refer for the truth of the various statements—every one of which we are assured can be verified by competent witnesses.

From the various facts adduced, it will be seen that those legitimate ties which should always exist between landlords and their tenants, were unscrupulously and ungenerously torn asunder by the priests and prelates throughout the country. The spiritual terrors of the other world were brought to bear by those relentless ecclesiastics on the kindlier feelings of members of their flocks, to compel them to vote against their landlord and their friend, merely because he happened to be a Protestant.

How fully verified by those proceedings has been the prognostication of one who more than forty years ago, in reference to a speech of the Right Hon. C. Plunkett, in the House of Commons,* on the Catholic Claims, observed,

“ You would indeed invert the order of civil society, you would see the man of fortune, connexions, and character, driven out of his county, by a man who had neither fortune, connexions, or character ; you would have the Catholic hierarchy and the priesthood on the side of the latter ; his cause would be the cause of religion and of the church ; he would carry his election, not by his fortune, his character or connexions, but by the bigotry and fanaticism of the people. Ireland would exhibit a constant, continued scene of discord and contention, till another convulsion would lead to another pacification.”

LEINSTER.

COUNTY DUBLIN.

From the Dublin Evening Herald, July 16, 1852

“ In the chapel of Lusk, last Sunday, the priest of that parish, at the usual period of addressing the people during mass, called every voter he knew to be in the chapel, by name, to the rails of the altar. He then warned them, in the first place, of the strictly religious character of the political struggle now going on, and proceeded individually, and in the face of the congregation, to caution them against voting, under any influence or any circumstances, for any other than Messrs. Craven and Lentainge. He then intimated that it was well known that his clerical character would prevent his doing them any mischief, but that he would be by no means surprised if those who despised his advice and the interests of the church, had their houses burnt over their heads.

“ Large bodies of ruffianly coalporters have been this day despatched on jaunting-cars to various parts of the country, for the purpose of giving their peculiar support to Messrs. Craven and Lentainge. Several hundred bludgeons, newly cut for the occasion, were wrested by the police from the hands of numbers of the unqualified supporters of the priests’ nominees.

“ The kidnapping of voters has been carried on with extraordinary activity. Fourteen electors, most of whom are said to be Mr. Hamilton’s own tenants, are at this moment stated to be under lock and key in the committee-rooms of the Liberal candidates, in Westmorland-street.

* Session of 1813.

“Two cases, indicative of the stringency of the spiritual and physical influence brought to bear upon the humbler supporters of Messrs. Hamilton and Taylor, we shall mention. A tenant who was under large obligations to Mr. Hamilton, and who had cheerfully promised him his vote, came to him, on Tuesday, and told him that he had been given to understand that if he redeemed his pledge, his house would be burned over his head, and all his cattle loughed. Another who had, under similar circumstances, made the same promise, told him that his priest had pointedly informed him, that if he dared to fulfil his engagement, he should be placed under all the penalties of excommunication.”

From Saunders' News Letter, July 21.

DENOUNCING ELECTORS IN THE COUNTY DUBLIN.—On Sunday last the officiating priest in a parish only a few miles from the metropolis took occasion to address the people in the chapel, and spoke in the most vehement terms against the government. He then denounced an elector, who was present, as having voted for Hamilton and Taylor, and the object of this notice was turned out of the chapel amid a scene of great tumult. Several of those present became much excited, and going out into the street of the village gave occasion for alarm by stating that their place of worship was about to be attacked, and that the Stockport outrages were about to be repeated.

CO. KILDARE.

MEETING AT ATHY.

From the Leinster Express, July 17.

In consequence of a resolution issuing from the Kildare Independent Club, at Naas, a meeting was held in the town of Athy, on last Tuesday, for the purpose of devising the best means of effecting the return of Messrs. Cogan and Henchy as the representatives of the County at the ensuing election.

Notwithstanding it being the market day, and that the Assizes had not terminated, the throng in the town was not, under the circumstances, unusual. The strictest order and decorum was observed. A platform was erected in the vicinity of the chapel, which was sufficient to accommodate about fifty persons. At one o'clock the principal leaders of the movement proceeded from Kavanagh's Hotel to the platform. Amongst those in attendance were the Rev. Messrs. Doyle, P. P., of Naas, Tierney, P. P., Carragh, Brennan, P. P., Kildare, Malone, C. C., Thomas Greene, C. C., J. Bray, C. C., Thomas Cullen, C. C., J. Wyer, C. C., O'Rourke, C. C., Laurence Cummin, P. P., Rev. Mr. Conolly, James Wall, C. C., O'Dyer, C. C.; W. H. F. Cogan, D. O'Connor Henchy, Robert Cassidy William Caulfield, John Hickie.

From the Kilkenny Moderator.

PRIESTLY DOINGS IN CASTLECOMER.—The most determined persecution of those who voted “against their church” has been entered upon by the Roman Catholic clergy. On Sunday last, Mr. Patrick Ryan, of Castlecomer, who had split his vote for Butler and Greene, was going to mass, and just as he had dropped his money into the box at the chapel door, he was collared and marched out, by the direction of the priest; he was then handed over to the tender mercies of a savage mob, who hooted and pelted him with stones to his own house. Several others were kicked out of Muckalee chapel, on Sunday, and treated with every indignity by the congregation.

MEATH.*From the Evening Packet.*

ALTAR DENUNCIATION.—In Meath perhaps, more than in any of the Irish counties, the most glaring examples of priestly intimidation have been afforded. The following specimens of altar denunciation, uttered there on Sunday, exhibit the extent to which bigotry is now carried in Ireland. The party addressed was an elector, the speaker the priest at the altar! We quote from the letter of a correspondent; “In the presence of the ‘Most High,’ before the ‘Living God,’ and before the crucifix before you, will you not vote for Lucas—you Jemmy Martin? who will you vote for now?”

“The same question was repeated by the parish priest in the parish of Robermeen during Divine service, to all his voters (41). It was also administered to all Mr. Waller’s tenants, who had promised their votes to Mr. Grattan.”

Mr. Henry Grattan, having spent the best part of his life in advancing the interests of Popery, thus, on the hustings described his humiliating position—

“He had never betrayed them—he opposed and assisted in turning out Lord John Russell. He was chairman of the Irish Brigade. He would continue to stand by them. If they selected Mr. Lucas, they would put him (Mr. Lucas) in a very painful position.”

The Telegraph thus describes the treatment which the sham-patriot received—

“The scene which next followed baffles description. The audience *en masse* turned on Mr. Grattan, who stood a calm and pitying spectator of the conduct by which they were degrading themselves. With clenched teeth and ferocious grins the crowd poured out their venom with a bitterness we have never seen

exhibited even towards ultra-Orangemen, on the head of the fearless and undaunted patriot, who seemed quietly to dare the ungrateful and infatuated mob to their worst. Hootings, hisses, yells, and noises of the most original barbarity, mingled with the cries of 'a groan for the Orange Catholics,' 'go hide yourself,' 'put him out,' 'dirty fellow,' 'shame,' 'Orange Catholic helping you,' &c., filled the Court-house."

And we are told at the close, that—

"The honourable gentleman was constantly groaned and insulted throughout his splendid address, which did not appear to produce the slightest effect on his besotted hearers. During the latter part his speech, a crazy looking, elderly man, wearing a white hat, who stood under the bench, *a la Jeremy Diddler*, with black crape, shook him by the coat, in the exuberance of his impatience. Mr. Grattan was constantly called on to sit down for half an hour before he resumed his seat."

THE MEATH ELECTION AND MR. REYNOLDS.

The following letter has been addressed by a Roman Catholic priest to a Cotemporary :—

"Sir—I have seen with much surprise, on my arrival in town by the ten o'clock p.m. train, a speech of Mr. John Reynolds in which he has had the daring presumption to say that 'it was well for Mr. Lucas that he (Alderman Reynolds) was not at the Meath election.'

"As Mr. Reynolds would seem, from this form of expression, to convey to his hearers the notion that he would influence the noble constituency of Meath to change their opinion of their chosen representative, I feel myself called upon in charity at once to check his insolent self-sufficiency. The voters of Meath have already measured Mr. Reynolds, and know how to appreciate his opinions.

"The members of the old brigade are much misled by folly or vanity if they suppose that their dictation will be submitted to by the honest and independent freeholders of Ireland. We were threatened in Meath that he, and Mr. Keogh and others, would come and support Mr. Grattan against the loved candidate of the people's choice; and if we had room for regret amid our rejoicing, it was that they did not come and give us an opportunity of proving to the world their hollowness and corruption.

"Pardon me for trespassing so long on your columns, but I could not rest to-night after this ebullition of vanity and presumption without endeavouring publicly to check it.

"Meath, in her priesthood, sat in calm council, and selected as her representative one of the purest, best, and most gifted of this earth's children, and it would need more than the efforts of

the 'immaculate juggler,' John Reynolds, to make her change her choice.

"I remain yours respectfully,
"RICHARD J. KELSH C. C., Meath."

From the Correspondent of Saunders, August 3, 1852.

DUNSHAUGHLIN, JULY 31.—Now that the excitement of the contest is subsiding, we begin to see what has been cast up by the troubled waters—we are able to trace the outline of those effects which are likely to remain permanent. The victory of the priests is like that of Pyrrhus, "Another such and they are undone." Their triumph is bought at too dear a price—it is recoiling upon themselves. A change that has been for some time violently making its way in the minds of the more respectable farmers and tradespeople has at length fairly evinced itself in the most open and avowed expression. They no longer conceal their opinion of the part their clergy took, or of their conduct during the recent election. That awe which an imaginative people has transferred from the office to the person of the priest has received a blow from which it is not likely soon to recover—men who a few years since would have feared being accursed for uttering a disgraceful word against a clergyman, now speak of them in terms which their bitterest opponents would be sorry to employ. They seem to have become enamoured of this freedom of speech. A most respectable Roman Catholic shopkeeper the other day, in describing a priest in presence of a Roman Catholic gentleman and a Protestant clergyman, said that "his conduct had been ruffianly during the election, and that he was fit to be only what he so much resembled, a thimble-rigger at a race course." If this does not actually describe the Rev. gentleman, it at least shows the impression he had made on the speaker. The priest alluded to certainly made himself sufficiently if not enviably conspicuous at the election. But the most pertinent and most pregnant remark that we have heard since this freedom of speech commenced, was made by one whom a priest had denounced to be a "marked" man, as he did not intend to vote for Lucas—"My clergy (said he) have denounced me; I have no notion to pay men to abuse and injure me—they may look elsewhere for their dues." "Aye (said another), they will find themselves obliged to beg alms from the Government after all." There is still some rumour of Lucas being obliged to prove his qualification.

WESTMEATH.

From the Westmeath Guardian.

WESTMEATH.—On Sunday last (the better day the better deed) business really commenced. Dr. Cantwell announced,

from the altar of his cathedral, that he had addressed a circular to all the priests in the country, requiring their attendance at the chapel-house to determine who should represent the county in parliament. He expressed his dissatisfaction at the unwarrantable freedom with which some candidates and their friends had used his name, and declared that he had not, up to the present, directly or indirectly, given a single candidate in the field his support, or permission to use the influence of his name when canvassing. On Monday their reverences met at the chapel-house. None but the parish priests were permitted to be present, and doubtless "his lordship" did not feel disposed to admit the curates, as he had the evil attendant upon such a course before his eyes in the fate of the Liberal Club. The several candidates were in town, and a good deal of anxiety was evinced by all parties respecting the choice of the clerical club. At one time it was said that Messrs. Magan and Urquhart had been nominated, and such we believe was the fact; but some of their reverences contended that the club was resuscitated in their persons, and insisted upon resorting to the ballot, as the most convenient and by far the *fairest* method of deciding the point at issue. The names of the several candidates were then written upon slips of paper which were afterwards shuffled in a hat and had two drawn out, but unfortunately they turned out to be the wrong candidates. A division was afterwards taken, when there appeared for—

Mr. Magan	-	-	-	-	8
Sir P. Nugent	-	-	-	-	2
Mr. Ennis	-	-	-	-	21
Pollard and Mostyn	-	-	-	-	23

Sir R. Levinge was not named, he stands alone, which of course he prefers to being found in bad company. One thing is quite certain, that the hon. baronet, though not nominated by their reverences, will stand at the head of the poll.

The following correspondence has taken place in reference to this election :—

" TO W. B. SMYTHE, ESQ.

" Collinstown, July 30, 1852.

" Sir—A person has just informed me that you are resolved, in conjunction with other proprietors who are for restricting the religious liberty of their Catholic fellow-countrymen, to commence exterminating your Catholic tenantry as soon as possible. You have read history with little advantage if you think that all the terrors which can be brought to bear upon them will make them surrender their faith, which is dearer to them than their property or their lives. What the Nero's of their day could not uproot or destroy, is not likely to fall before the combined vengeance of the Westmeath bigots: and I

am sorry to find that your reading of the Bible has produced only fruits of bitterness and unchristian hatred towards your fellow-man. And yet you would have us believe that Protestants alone are under the guidance of the Almighty, because they assume the exclusive prerogative of being Bible readers. What would an infidel say, who would be informed of your determination to inflict your vengeance upon persons who voted according to their conscience, and against the assailers of their country and creed? Verily, you, Protestants, have a strange way of showing yourselves followers of a meek and a merciful Redeemer, or of satisfying any discerning mind that love, and not malice, is your striking characteristic. Why, sir, if it were in your power to play the tyrant to your heart's content, and after possessing yourself of all the hard-earned property in the soil, created by the persevering industry of your Catholic tenants, you also demand their lives, all these your Catholic tenants would cheerfully yield sooner than support a man who was pledged to join Lord Derby in forging new fetters for their religion, and who, of course, would be a defender of the Stockport havoc and murder. I was always willing and ready to bear testimony to any act of yours that even savoured of liberality, and I am now compelled in truth and justice to upbraid you with a manifestation of the most unchristian feeling towards those who differ from you in religion. You seem to expect that your tenants owe you, besides the toil of their bodies, and the sweat of their brows, and their rents, their souls to boot so that your idea of a tenant is, that he should be the slave of a task-master, have no free will, and go, body and soul, to the devil, if his landlord tells him to do so. What can we say of Protestantism after this?

“Your obedient servant,

“MICHAEL COGHLAN.”

“TO THE REV. M. COGHLAN, P. P.

“Barbavilla House, July 31st, 1852.

“Sir—The last time I saw you was at the head of a bludgeon-armed mob, endeavouring to terrify all opponents. The style of your letter suits such a position well. If you ever received the information alleged, you know in your heart you do not believe it; and you know equally well that neither Sir R. Levinge nor I ‘would be a defender of the Stockport havoc or murder.’ You have gratuitously and arrogantly taken upon yourself the office of ‘upbraiding me with a manifestation of the most unchristian feeling’—with the subtle intention of henceforward ascribing every proceeding I may have to direct against a defaulting tenant to the spirit of religious persecution. I know you well, sir, you can flatter and you can threaten—and you have found that neither threats nor flattery have

ever made me change my line of conduct—nor will they do so now. I shall neither be deterred by you from the due enforcement of my legal rights, nor shall I be excited to undue severity by your conduct. You have happily not attained the ascendancy you seek for your religion—an ascendancy which would even be more fatal to the liberties of my fellow-countrymen, among the Roman Catholic laity, than those of the Protestants—a fact, of which in spite of ‘Catholic unity,’ Roman Catholics in other parts of Ireland have shown themselves more aware than in this intolerant county, and in this especially bigotted place; for you have the calm satisfaction of knowing that you were more decidedly successful in producing discord between my tenants and myself—who have always resided here, and on whom you have sometimes bestowed your invidious and treacherous praise—than upon the properties of those neighbouring landlords, whether resident or non-resident, whom you were in the habit of abusing in speech or in print.

“Before I end, I take the opportunity of making a communication intended by me, before hearing from you. I, too, have been informed (but I believe it) that there is an intention on the part of some of your flock, sooner or later, to gratify their fiendish and avowed malice against all who voted for Sir Richard Levinge about here, and against all Protestants. Now, Sir, I announce plainly that, whatever may be my present resolves, I shall feel it my duty to remove one Roman Catholic tenant for every such outrage, whoever may be the guilty party; and further, that in case of what is called ‘popular vengeance’ falling upon myself for so doing, I have taken measures to secure that a just civil retribution shall fall upon this estate, such as would make many a one deplore for the rest of their lives that any listened to such fatal suggestions. I now, Sir, take my leave of you, and of all correspondence with you. Sincerely wishing you better guidance, I am, your obedient,

“W. B. SMYTHE.

“P.S.—The two letters are sent to be printed for the information of the public.”

DUNDALK.

From the Newry Telegraph.

The Rev. Dr. Kieran presented himself, and was received with loud cheering. When silence was restored, he proceeded to assert his right, though a clergyman, to take the part he had come there to take in this election, and in doing so he contended he did not in any manner compromise his ecclesiastical character. The clergy were not aliens in blood, language, or religion, to the people of this country, and it was impossible

for them to look coolly on, while matters were passing that affected, as well their spiritual as their temporal interests, without being influenced by and taking a part in them. (Cheers.) Only that the element that had always mixed itself up with their struggles heretofore, more or less was mixed up with the proceedings of to-day, the Catholic clergy would be found aloof from the struggle, and would be at a distance invoking the blessings of heaven on their cause. It required no interpretation to tell them that the element to which he referred was the religion to which the Irish people belonged. He went on to allude to the protracted struggle for Catholic emancipation, which had been ultimately granted, and a pledge given thereby, that the Catholic was not to be degraded or insulted again on account of his religion, and said they had found that faith had been broken with them, and that the struggle would have to begin again in the new. Again was their faith made the subject of truculent mockery, tyrannic legislation, and the Catholic Church was only allowed to live by sufferance. (Hear, hear.) The rev. gentleman then dwelt at great length on the introduction and passing of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill by Lord John Russell, and said for one he could never forget the punishment inflicted upon that man, and for one he never would wish to see him back in power; but bad as he was he would not do what Lord Derby was doing; for into every wound that Lord John Russell made Lord Derby was planting the sting of the scorpion. (Yells and groans.) The restorative that Lord Derby would give them, after their wounds, was a dose of prussic acid. (Cheers and hisses.) He then alluded to the anomalous condition of the churches of this country—the Protestant, Presbyterian, and Catholic—and contended that one of the Bishops of the former was paid as much as the whole of the Catholic clergy put together. Small as the sum was that was granted to Maynooth for the education of the clergy of the people, that sum, the Derby administration were going to take away. They did not find it convenient to attempt it last session, but they all know that the cry of the Derby party at the present elections was—"Down with Maynooth." (Loud yelling, and cries of hear, hear.) It might be that Maynooth had given offence by the conduct of some of its clergy; that might be, but what had their religious houses done? What had their poor Nuns done, that they should be threatened with a Cromwellian visitation? that their privacy should be intruded on. They got nothing from the State, they educated the poor, and the reward that was proposed for their benevolent exertions to be given by Lord Derby was, to put their establishments on the footing of a lunatic Asylum. (Groans for Lord Derby.) He then alluded to the proclamations against processions, and said that crime, drunkenness, and immorality, might stalk abroad through the land without let or hindrance, but their clergy

could not even attend the consecration of a church in their religious habits without subjecting themselves to a prosecution and a fine, and if the fine was not paid they would be dragged to prison like felons. Every man, therefore, who was a friend to Lord Derby should be a foe to them. He next proceeded to shew that Captain Jocelyn would not suit them as a Member, principally because he would follow suit with his brother in the House of Lords, and stated that if any Catholic voted for him he would prove himself a recreant to his country and a felon to his creed. (Uproar.) He then addressed himself to Mr. Gartlan whom he had eulogized; but said he was not first in the field, as arrangements had been made with Mr. Bowyer long before he addressed the electors; and even if he were first in the field, there was one strong objection to him. He was a clever man, a powerful advocate; but there was one thing he would not believe—he would not believe that he would leave his large family, and lucrative profession, and reside in London for the mere purpose of serving them. (“No, no, and groans, and yelling.”) There might be times when it might be quite lawful to look for place and take it; but these were not the times; and it was clear the majority of the Liberal electors of Dundalk were not for Gartlan. (“No, no,” and groans, accompanied with cheers.) He might persevere if he chose, but he Dr. Kieran) told him if he did he would inflict a deadly wound on the religion to which he professed to belong. The spiritual mother of Mr. Gartlan begged of him not to thrust his sword into the heart of his church, and he (Dr. Kieran) trusted he would attend to her request. (Hear, and cheers.) He trusted if he did persevere that he would not have to regret at a future day that he had been the means of forcing a Tory candidate on Dundalk, and he would therefore recommend Mr. Gartlan to retire and make way for Mr. Bowyer. The Rev. gentleman then proceeded at great length to show the claims of Mr. Bowyer to their suffrages, dwelling particularly on the fact that he had been recommended to them by the highest authorities of their church. He concluded by moving that Mr. Bowyer be their representative in the next Parliament. (Tremendous cheering, yelling, and groaning, which lasted for several minutes.)

KING'S CO.

From the Correspondent of Saunders' News Letter.

Parsonstown, Thursday Evening.

Since the nomination of candidates for the representation of this county, on Tuesday last, at Tullamore, both parties have been most active and persevering in their exertions to secure

the attendance of the voters. Every possible species of intimidation is resorted to by the priests and their mobs to deter the electors from coming to the poll. Yesterday information reached here that the clergy and rabble were about to carry off many voters. Francis V. Bennett, Esq. Monastereven House, on hearing of it, at once proceeded to his property, and brought into town several of his tenants who had promised to vote in accordance with his wishes. Mr. B. W. Holmes shortly after arrived with his supporters. The tenantry on the estates of the Earl of Rosse, who had also been canvassed on the part of Captain Bernard, had promised to come in. At Newtown, where many of them were on their way, a large mob assembled and fired several shots, so that the tenantry were obliged to return to their dwellings. One man came in and swore informations as to the facts.

In the neighbourhood of Clonbonire and Lisclooney, in the barony of Carrycastle, the peasantry, at the instance of their priests, assembled, and prevented the tenantry of Lord Rosse from coming here.

Large mobs paraded the town to a late hour, shouting and yelling most terrifically. They broke the windows of the house where Messrs. Bennett and Holmes' tenantry stopped, but when charged by the police, the mob fled in all directions. A large party of police remained up all night to protect the house and the voters. In the afternoon George Heenan, Esq. agent to the Earl of Rosse, accompanied by a magistrate and an escort, proceeded to the barony of Garrycastle, and returned at four o'clock this morning with the voters. Mr. Heenan then went to Newtown, and has come back with the voters who were deterred yesterday by the mob from coming to poll. From an early hour this morning the town has been paraded by large mobs headed by priests, and such was their violence that three or four of Mr. Bennett's tenantry became so frightened that they joined them. In Duke-street all the shop windows are closed. It is openly stated that the town is to be completely filled to-morrow when the polling commences. "Barricades" are erecting outside the Court-house, so that the voters may have free access to the booths. A great number of Capt. Bernard's supporters have come in this evening. Messrs. Bland and O'Brien, the other candidates, are here. They and several priests addressed the mobs to-day, and every possible effort is making to carry the election by violence and outrage. Last night no less than 15 shots were fired into the dwelling-house of Mr. G. Edgill, of Lingford, in the barony of Ballybritt, in order to deter him from voting for Capt. Bernard. About 100 police are here, under the command of Sub-Inspector Anderson. A company of the 16th depot marched this morning to Ferbane in aid of the civil power. — Dopping, Esq. R.M., has arrived here on temporary duty, in consequence

of Capt. Pollock, R.M. having been required at Tullamore. Much dissatisfaction is expressed in consequence of cavalry not having been sent here as yet.

Half-past Six o'Clock.

Mr. Scrope Bernard has been attacked in the streets, and pelted with stones by the mob. He had a very narrow escape, Several of his friends rallied round him, and captured four of his assailants, against whom informations have been lodged. The 150 special constables sworn in on Monday have been supplied with batons, and many of them are on duty. The riot act was read, and the Depot of the 16th Foot, under the command of Major Coppinger, have just arrived from the barracks, and are under arms in Cumberland-square. The priests seeing the effect their harangues are likely to produce, and being fearful of the consequences, are advising the people to go home.

CONDUCT OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGYMEN—As the struggle for the representation of this county approaches, the priests are busily engaged disturbing society and agitating the population, in order to endeavour to return their nominees, both of whom are utter "strangers" in the county, and neither of them having a particle of property within it. The violence of the harangues delivered each succeeding Sabbath from the altars have now assumed an aspect which must be regarded with an anxiety, and it may be truly added, with an inquiet and alarm by all those who desire the common peace of the community and the general tranquillity of the country. The crusade is against "law and order," and the rights of property; and it is time, before actual violence and riot follow, to stem the torrent. From one end of this county to the other the most fearful anathemas are threatened to be poured on the heads of those who will dare to vote against "their priests and their religion." Some of the clergy have gone further, and on last Sunday so violent was the language made use of by a priest in Banagher chapel against the Government and constitution of the country, that the officer in charge of a detachment of the 9th Regiment, quartered in that town, felt it his duty to direct the men to retire from the house of worship. Meetings are held every Sunday, at which the principal speakers are clergy, in different parts of the county, but much to their mortification the vast majority of the tenant farmers have held aloof from these gatherings, nearly all of which have proved failures.

From another Correspondent.

Parsonstown, July 22.

This town is the scene at this moment of the most frightful excitement and disorder, that can be conceived. The landlords

are utterly paralyzed—all their efforts to protect their tenantry from the open and undisguised intimidation of the priests, have been unavailing. The parish priest of this town is parading the streets at the head of an infuriated mob, capturing every voter he can find, and bringing them *vi et armis* down to the premises where the voters of Messrs. Bland and O'Brien are locked up, under the guardianship of a body of priests. Large numbers of the tenantry of Lord Rosse, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Hackett, and the other large landed proprietors came in last night and during this morning, and from the moment of their arrival here the Roman Catholic clergymen have been incessant in their efforts to take them off to their camp. They are actually bringing the wives of the voters to the houses, and sending them with orders to bring out their husbands, and in many instances they have succeeded; still the county is for the most part in favour of Captain Bernard, and he will assuredly be returned if the people will be permitted to come to the poll. Military are pouring in from the adjacent districts to Tullamore, Philipstown, and this district. It is apprehended that great violence will be resorted to, and certainly the mobs are at this moment giving many clear indications of it. I shall give you the state of the poll at the earliest moment possible. The polling commences in the morning.

BRUTAL ATTACK ON CAPT. BERNARD'S VOTERS.

From the Correspondent of Saunders' News Letter.

A man named Michael Harte, whose arrest was reported in a recent number of Saunders' News Letter, and another named James Heaman, subsequently arrested, charged with being of the party who attacked and beat Montgomery Robbins, Esq., and other electors, when on their way to vote for Capt. Bernard at the recent election, were brought up for final examination at Parsonstown Petty Sessions, on Friday last.

Montgomery Robbins, Esq., deposed—On the 23d of July I came in a covered car, accompanied by one Peter Roe and one Joseph Sheppard, voters, from Dooly's Hotel towards the Court-house, in which the polling booths were placed in the town of Birr; the cars stopped within 60 or 80 yards of the Court-house, opposite the house of the Rev. Henry Fry; the Rev. Mr. Cleary, who is a Roman Catholic clergyman (I don't know his Christian name or present residence), came up to the car, and addressing the said Joseph Sheppard, said, "Joe, what are you doing there, you must come out;" I replied, he cannot come out; Rev. Mr. Cleary, said he must come out; I replied he shall not; Rev. Mr. Cleary then caught the door of the car and pulled it open; I caught the door then and closed it, and Rev. Mr. Cleary left us; directly on his parting from the car

three or four men singled themselves out from the crowd, and a regular attack was made on Mr. Robbins, and his friends.

The Roman Catholic tenants who voted for Captain Bernard are still subject to annoyance. On last Sunday, at several chapels, their families were ordered home, and the seats which they had occupied for several years were broken into pieces, and thrown out of the chapels.

CLOSE OF THE ELECTION.

From the Leinster Express.

On Monday, at Eleven o'clock, the High Sheriff, J. G. King, Esq., and his Assessor, Charles Cuffe, Esq., attended at the Court House of Tullamore, for the purpose of announcing the number of votes recorded for each candidate, and for formally declaring the representatives for the County. There was a large number of Roman Catholic clergymen in attendance from the different polling districts. The Very Rev. Dr. O'Rafferty, and J. F. Rolleston, Esq., were on the Bench with the High Sheriff and Assessor. The chosen candidates, now the representatives of the people, were in attendance, accompanied by their conducting Agents, Messrs. E. Nugent and Treacy. The Court house was crowded, but every person was disposed, not only to preserve order, but also, to strictly observe it in his own person. They were met like persons disposed to enjoy their triumph without any offensive manifestations towards those who differed from them in creed and politics. This state of things must have been the result of oil thrown on the troubled waters, by the priests on Sunday; and indeed, it must have required no small share of exhortations, to lay the fearful spirit of excitement, and angry feeling which they had evoked, during the previous month. Men who had promised their landlords, were induced to violate those promises, even at the last moment. The clergymen were like so many intimidatory spirits in each polling booth; and no matter what may have been the voter's determination on coming up, the moment he came under the influence of his spiritual and temporal director in the booth, that moment his courage quailed; he forgot his landlord, and all his promises, and protestations to, at least, give one vote to Captain Bernard, and split for Bland or O'Brien.

One or two instances will suffice, to show how the affair was conducted.

John Dunne of Aughnabrack Glebe, came into the Booth.

Mr. John Jackson, Tullamore, who acted as Sheriff's deputy, asked him for whom he would vote.

Dunne—(Looking around him somewhat bewildered) I promised my landlord a vote.—Who is your landlord? Mr. Coote (The Rev. Ralph Coote). He is not a candidate; the candi-

dates are Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Bland, and Mr. Bernard; are you going to split?

Dunne—(Still in a state of bewilderment, and shunning the stern glance of his priest, who was opposite to him), I promised my landlord a vote.

Mr. Jackson again told him that his landlord was not a candidate; and having again repeated the names of the gentlemen who were, he asked him for whom he would vote.

Dunne, now evidently half mesmerized by the steady stare of his priest, became quite oblivious of his promises to his landlord, exclaimed in a hurried manner. "I will be guided by Father Lynch."

Mr. Jackson—Father Lynch will give you no instructions now; there are three candidates, which will you vote for?

Dunne—(Holding down his head) I suppose Bland and O'Brien.

The next voter that offered was Matthew Connoud, also from Aughnabrack Glebe.

On the question being put to him by Mr. Jackson, his answer was—"I will vote the same as him, (John Dunne,) let us die the one death.

There is no doubt but for the intimidation exercised over the people's minds by their Spiritual Instructors, that Captain Bernard would have been at the head of the poll, for he had been promised, either personally or through his friends, votes from upwards of two-thirds of the electors.

INTIMIDATION.

From the Saunders' Correspondent.

The Roman Catholic clergy seem not to be content with the victory they have gained in this (the King's) county; they continue to persecute and annoy those of their flocks who despite of their reverences and their mobs, dared to record their votes for Capt. Bernard. On Sunday last the most fearful anathemas were poured from the altars against the "Renegades," as the refractory voters are termed by the priests. At two chapels on Sunday last some of Lord Rosse's tenantry who had voted for Captain Bernard attended mass. The officiating clergymen having observed them amongst the congregations cried out, "Black Sheep," and ordered them to be turned out, which command was instantly obeyed, and the voters, amidst hooting and yelling were driven from their places of worship. The priests, prior to the contest, publicly made it known that they would withhold the rites of their church from such of its members as would vote for Captain Bernard, and they are faithfully keeping their promises—every species of annoyance is resorted to. A woman named Murray, whose husband is a tenant on the estate of Francis V. Bennett, Esq. Thomastown House, and

who voted for Captain Bernard, when she appeared in the market of Parsonstown on Monday to dispose of milk was hooted, the milk spilled, the vessels broken, and she driven from the market-place. Within the last two days several tenant farmers have lodged informations on oath, stating that large mobs, headed and led on by priests, visited their premises, threatened to burn their houses, and dragged them by force and violence, and against their will and consent to vote for Bland and O'Brien. Mr. Robbins, one of the gentlemen who was so severely beaten when on his way to the poll, as reported in *Saunders' News-Letter* of Saturday last, still continues confined to his bed from the effects of the injuries he received. One of the assailants, who has been captured, has three wounds on his head, which were inflicted with a life preserver by Mr. Bridge, when the murderous attack was made upon him and Mr. Robbins. There is one case of voting which deserves to be recorded. In one of the booths a person was brought up to vote for Bland and O'Brien; his Christian name did not correspond with the registry, and he declined to take the necessary oath. He withdrew, and was brought into a public-house, where he was re-baptized by a party who brought him back to the booth, and so satisfied his conscience that he took the oath and voted. It is notorious that a few dead men have been polled, and that there have been several cases of personation.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE KING'S CO. CHRONICLE.

Maystown, July 26.

MR. EDITOR.—I beg to state that a most disgraceful scene occurred at the Roman Catholic Chapel of High-street, on yesterday. A farmer named James Egan, of Lisclooney, a tenant of Lord Ross's, who voted for Captain Bernard, was forcibly ejected out of the chapel and chapel-yard by the congregation. At the time Egan entered the chapel, the priest was denouncing those of their party who voted against them. His words then were—"There were recreants amongst them who went out from them, and they would keep them out, and called on them not to assist such men in distress;" whereupon the whole congregation cried out—"No, never," "hear, hear." After this the congregation turned on Egan, pushed him out through the chapel door, and from thence to the gate, the whole chapel and yard presenting a scene of uproar and confusion: in fact they seemed to be more like savage barbarians than civilized christians. When expulsion had been effected, one fellow, with a countenance as furious as a tiger, stood at the chapel door, and called out—"Come in boys, and finish mass." This statement you may rely upon being correct, and without exaggeration, and I hope you will give it publicity, as such scandalous conduct should not be concealed.

Your obedient Servant, a LOOKER-ON.

From the Kings Co. Chronicle.

Mr. Garvey, Lady Norbury's agent, on Thursday, had met at Durrow Abbey those of her ladyship's tenants who had declared their determination to vote for Captain Bernard, and during the time they were remaining there the Rev. Mr. O'Ferral, a P. P. or C. C. came up to the Abbey with some empty cars, and used all efforts of spiritual and physicial threats to induce the tenants to accompany him and vote for Messrs. O'Brien and Bland, notwithstanding their previous engagements. Only four yielded, and the rest being there protected from the latter class of menaces remained with their agent until a competent force had been despatched by Captain Pollock to protect them, and they were thus safely escorted to the polling booth. But here the influence of the priests prevailed, and all except eight voted against Captain Bernard.

On Friday morning last, the Rev. Mr. O'Leary, R.C.C. of Shinrone, denounced one of his flock in the public street of that town, in the presence and hearing of some hundreds of persons, whom he had collected for that purpose, his avowed reason for which was that this man had promised to vote for Captain Bernard. Numbers of the Roman Catholic electors who had promised to vote for Captain Bernard were taken and forced away from their homes to prevent them from voting.

PARSONSTOWN (KING'S CO.) PETTY SESSIONS.

From Correspondent of Saunders' News Letter.

A VOTER DENOUNCED—A decent-looking farmer's wife, named Elizabeth Hoolahan and her son, Michael Hoolahan, residing at Ballywilliam in the barony of English, summoned two repulsive-looking women, named Judith Carry and Betty Williams, for threatening and abusing them.

Michael Hoolahan being sworn, corroborated his mother's statement as to the conduct of Judith Carry. The week after the election Betty Williams met him on the road near his own house and asked "did I hear how the priest of English had denounced and cursed my father from the altar on the Sunday previous, for having voted against his religion, and against his wishes?" She then said my father was a perjurer, and that in consequence of going against his clergy he would be d——d. Both prisoners were committed.

ASSAULT IN A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHAPEL.

From Saunders' Correspondent.

Sunday week last, at several of the Roman Catholic chapels in the King's County where any of the electors who had voted for Captain Bernard attended, the congregations were greatly disturbed and the service interrupted, in consequence of the

electors having been forcibly driven out of the chapels, amidst hooting and yelling. At the chapel of High-street, in the barony of Garrycastle, a farmer named James Egan, a tenant on the Earl of Rosse's estate, was rather roughly handled because he had voted for Captain Bernard. Egan on the following day lodged information against three of his assailants. A warrant has been issued for their apprehension, but only one of them James Martin, made amenable; he was admitted to bail. Tuesday, the 3rd of August instant, was fixed for hearing the charge, at Mullaghatoar petty sessions. The novelty of the case attracted a large number of persons, and the result was looked for with much anxiety.

Mr. Dowling, solicitor, appeared for the accused, and made an application, grounded on an affidavit, for the postponement of the trial, in the absence of the Rev. James M'Cormick, R.C.C.

It did not appear that the defendant had made any exertion to procure the attendance of the Rev. Mr. M'Cormick, and as so many other persons had witnessed the assault, the court refused to grant the application.

James Egan being sworn, stated—I live at Lisclooney; I know the defendant James Martin; I attended mass at High-street chapel on Sunday week; I conducted myself reverently and orderly; Martin came up to my side, and gave me a push or jostle, and told me "to be off out of that;" I said to him, "Mind Martin you have assaulted me, and I will give you the benefit of the law;" Martin took me by the breast, and he with others pushed me out; the people cried out, "Put him out!" I resisted as much as I could, but I did not strike any one: I was struck twice: my handkerchief was torn from off my neck; it was thrown on the ground and trampled upon.

Sub-constable Connelly examined—I attended chapel at High-street on Sunday week last; I saw Egan forced out of the chapel and out of the chapel yard by the people; I saw James Martin amongst the crowd; I heard arguing in the body of the chapel; I saw Egan contending with some person whom I believe to be the defendant: a rush took place, and I was forced out; and the whole chapel became one scene of uproar and confusion; the prisoner was foremost in putting Egan out; I thought it dangerous to interfere.

Mr. Burdett—Why, was the conduct of the congregation so violent as that?

Witness—It was I called to the Rev. Mr. M'Cormick, who was on the altar, several times, but I got no answer.

Mr. Burdett—Was service going on?

Witness—Part of the ceremony of the mass was not over, but the sermon was finished; heard a man call out to the mob, after Egan was put out, "to come in and finish mass."

From the King's County Chronicle.

In our last publication we endeavoured to convey to our readers not present on that occasion, some faint conception of the scene of ruffian violence then adopted and put forward by the supporters of the Brigade candidates. The abominably wicked, and profligate methods to secure success resorted to without scruple or regard to decency on behalf of the Brigadier candidates, are irrefragible evidence that without those unconstitutional, unclerical, and unchristian means, the Roman Catholic Clergy would never have been able to bully and fight and *inquisitionise* their unknown favourites into a majority over Captain Bernard. It is only sufficient to refer to the facts, as they happened, to make the truth of this apparent.

From the time a dissolution was even talked of, almost every Roman Catholic clergyman in the county set to work, and commenced his game of violence and misrepresentation. Their first move was to exhort those of their flocks who possessed neither votes, nor property into vague but assured hopes of their conditions being bettered if they could at the next election master or alarm those who had property or who were living by their industry. This, with the lowest of the rabble, the untaught and half-houseless, and the many whose time is passed between sojourning in the workhouses and the desultory and precarious earnings outside them, produced its effect. We maintain it, and we can prove the fact that for months past the altars of many of the Roman Catholic chapels in this country have been desecrated by a mixture of political and superstitious speaking, in which no object was regarded but that of exciting the fierce prejudices and violent animosities of the lowest, most uninstructed and unprovided for, of the Roman Catholic population. By this means, on the approach of the election, they had organized a number of vagabonds, whose hopes and expectations for themselves were blindly enlisted in the cause of the Italian and selfish objects of the priesthood. Until a very short time before the election, few respectable Roman Catholics in this country took part in these proceedings and they were most anxious as far as they dare, to act like freemen and to discountenance them. In evidence of this we could name several (many in this town) who unequivocally promised their influence and support to Captain Bernard, because, as they said, he was a good resident landlord, a useful and accessible magistrate, a good employer, having an excellent personal knowledge of Irish affairs, and also because he was a good Irishman. The proprietors of land in this country were to a man his supporters, and their influence was further sustained by the fact that in no southern county in Ireland are there so many resident proprietors as in the King's County. They had all, even to their own injury, worked for the maintenance of the people during

the famine, and many of them still continue their benevolent dealings towards them; but this influence was the very thing hateful to the priesthood, and such men were not suitable to their aggrandising purposes. These influences being identified with our local interests, and having few objects beyond those connected with Ireland, were too likely to become acceptable to the people, and thus become the means of cementing a happy union between all classes and creeds of our country.

This was the last alliance their reverences were willing or desirous to behold or permit; and, accordingly, their whole efforts were directed to coerce the people into the belief that the Protestant gentry must be exterminated, they being, as they told them, the enemies of their faith and race. This belief was studiously impressed on the illiterate population of this country and they were thus driven into a frenzy against their Protestant neighbours, landlords, and employers. The priests having thus roused the people entrusted to their instruction in religion and morals, and who from their ignorance are strongly under such controul, commenced immediately after the selection of the two hitherto unknown candidates, Messrs. O'Brien and Bland, to direct those passions and this excitement towards the purpose of their election. To Captain Bernard and his friends and to all Protestants were attributed the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill and the recent proclamation; and harmless as both these grievances have hitherto proved themselves, they were magnified each Sunday into persecution of the worst description, calling for vengeance on, and the hatred of all Protestants. Nay, the Stockport riots were laid at the doors of Captain Bernard, and the most exaggerated and malicious accounts of it were unscrupulously promulgated. The electors, who had without hesitation or apprehension of wrong, promised to vote for Captain Bernard, were informed by priestly authority during their most solemn religious services, that every one of them in preserving his word should become guilty of perjury, of treason to his church, and an abettor of the insult given to the host in Stockport!! Every neighbour was to curse and avoid him; his name was published at mass, religious curses on himself, his family, and his innocent children, were piled upon him and them in case he should consummate his disobedience and keep his promise to his best friend and benefactor at the hustings, the breach of which was thus inculcated on him as a solemn religious duty, which it was the right of the church to require from her followers. With such teachings, is it wondered that such an exhibition of fell and demoniac ferocity should have been exhibited by the peasantry of this country at the recent election? They forced all the voters they could influence by the terror of the mob, by threats of murder and violence, and excommunication in this world, and damnation in the next, to vote for Messrs Bland and O'Brien. Neither Christianity,

propriety, or common decency supplied any restraints, and thus did they secure their majorities.

In Tullamore and Philipstown, like scenes were going on, and a like terror was exhibited. Captain Bernard was repeatedly assaulted, Messrs. Lundy Dickson, J.P. and Fuller, and others, were severely beaten, and their lives were only saved by the active exertions of the military and police.

PARSONSTOWN PETTY SESSIONS.

August, 7th.

Montgomery Robbins, Esq. being sworn, stated as follows—

On the 23rd July I came in a covered car, accompanied by one Peter Roe and one Joseph Sheppard, from Dooly's Hotel towards the Court-house, in which the polling booths were placed in Parsonstown. The car stopped within sixty or eighty yards of the court-house—opposite the house of the Rev. Henry Fry. The Rev. Mr. Cleary, who is a Roman Catholic clergyman; (I do not know his Christian name or present residence) came up to the car, and addressing the said Joseph Sheppard, said "Jee, what are you doing here, *you must come out*; I replied he cannot come out; *Mr. Cleary said he must come out*; I replied he shall not; *Mr. Cleary then caught the door of the car and pulled it open*; I caught the door then, and closed it, and Mr. Cleary left us; *directly on his parting from the car three or four men singled themselves out from the crowd*, and came to the car; *without saying a word one of them pulled open the door, and I was seized by the collar* by a person who tried to drag me out of the car; Mr. Lancaster Bridge came up to the car, and seized by the neck the man who was struggling with me; Mr. Bridge and the men who were at the car then disappeared, and I looked out and saw Mr. Bridge struggling with several persons who were around him; I got out of the car and went to his assistance; I was struck on the head and received several blows on different parts of the body; from the effects of these blows I was stunned, and I saw a man coming towards me with a stick in his hand upraised to strike me; I was unable to defend myself in consequence of the former injuries, and I received from him a blow which knocked me down, I became senseless from its effects, and I do not know what occurred afterwards; I had in my hand a loaded but, with which I defended myself as long as I could.

To Mr. Dowling—There was an immense crowd around us at the time, and I am unable to identify the prisoners.

Lancaster Bridge, Esq. was the next witness, and gave the following testimony:—On the 23rd of last month an inside car, in which Mr. Montgomery Robbins and two other persons were, drove towards the court-house; I was standing near it when it stopped within a short distance of the court-house; I saw three

or four men go up to the door of the car, and opened it; I then ran up to the car and saw a man trying to pull a person out of the car; I ran up to assist the persons in the car, when a man laid hold of me by the nose; I was immediately struck by several persons on the head and arms with sticks; I struck them in defence of myself; Mr Robbins was at this time out of the car, and in the crowd defending himself; I saw several persons striking at Mr. Robbins, and saw him fall; I immediately went to him and raised him up; he was bleeding and insensible, and fell on his knees again after I had lifted him up; I saw the prisoner, James Heenan, at the door of Mr. Robbin's car, before Mr. Robbins left the car; Heenan appeared to take an active part in endeavouring to drag some person out of the car; I saw the prisoner, Michael Harte, amongst the crowd with his head cut and bleeding; I would say, by his appearance, he was taking a part in the affray; I was myself severely cut in the forehead from the blows I received; I had in my hand, for my protection, a "life preserver," with which I defended myself as well as I could; I assisted Mr. Robbins to Captain Bernard's Tally-rooms; he was unable to walk without assistance; I lost my hat, and my coat was very much torn; I gave no provocation whatever for the attack that was made upon me.

QUEEN'S CO.

From the Leinster Express, July 17.

Of all the audacious, and unjustifiable efforts to tyrannise over the civil liberty of a free people, that which is now being striven for in the Queen's County, and throughout Ireland generally, by the priesthood, is hardly exceeded in audacity or injustice, by anything in records of history. Certainly, considering accompanying circumstances it would be impossible to find a parallel. For, in an empire like this, where individual liberty is more sacred than in any other under the sun, that any man, or any number of men should so glaringly make use of that license, for the purpose of enslaving his or their subjects—is a national humiliation and a national disgrace, from which any other people, who had equally the means, would shrink with scorn and detestation. In what free country except Ireland, would such a fraud on the public understanding be for a moment endured? Where, but in Ireland, could we find clerical presumption arguing such mental serfdom amongst the populace? Or where, but in Ireland, would a man allow himself to be so cheated into the resignation of his birthright,—into such a practical acknowledgment of his secular helplessness, and spiritual dread?

In whatever County or Borough, throughout the kingdom, the Roman Catholic clergy may succeed in their selfish and in-

tolerant views,—*there* for the once, the wishes of the community sink into utter insignificance, and utter unimportance. Popular independence is at an end, and popular representation becomes a mockery, a delusion, and a snare. A mockery—because the idea of popular representation is ridiculous, when the Roman Catholic clergy arrogate to themselves, the sole right of returning a member to the Imperial Parliament! A delusion—because it is delusive, and deceptive beyond condemnation,—to suppose that the man thus returned is really the representative of the people!! A snare,—because, as thus accruing, a vote is only a torment and a plague to the Roman Catholic who possesses it,—an excuse for his spiritual teacher to persecute him,—to spitefully use him;—and to curse him!!!

Let us just see what is the stuff, of which these clerico-popular elections are made. “The view into the other world of those Catholics who vote for Mr. Brown,” said the Rev. James Maher, when addressing the electors of Carlow last week, “is far from affording consolation. LET THEM GO AND BE DAMNED.” Nor is this an exceptional sample of the lengths, to which men in the position of Mr. Maher have resorted at the present juncture. We have been credibly informed, that more than one Roman Catholic clergyman in the Queen’s County, (some too, by the way, from whose superior intelligence we would not have expected it), threatened suspension of the church’s rites against those of their flocks, who would not vote as they desired. The pews of Mr. Fitzpatrick’s supporters in——chapel, were torn up, and broken down, without a word of rebuke or interference from the priest. And expressions to the following playful and harmless effect, were used a few Sundays ago from an Ossory altar.—“You all know Mr. M——. Well, he’s a black sheep amongst you. Now I don’t mean to call down the judgment of the Almighty on him; but if it so happened, that he should fall from his horse and break his head, or that his house, or haggard should accidently catch fire—I *wouldn’t at all wonder at it.*”

CARLOW.

[*From the Carlow Sentinel.*]

We have given the proceedings of this election down to the close of the poll on last night, by which it will be seen that it was a sharp race—a close contest, unprecedented even in this country. It was one of unexampled excitement, created by the Roman Catholic clergy; and they lost one seat by a small majority, while we lost one occupied by a gentleman who expended nearly 100,000*l* within five years in the barony of Rathvilly, where he was defeated by the degraded serfs who were one and all polled against a country gentleman by whose wealth

that very barony was enriched, and thousands kept from starvation or the poor house. The base ingratitude of the electors of that barony will not soon be forgotten, especially of those SLAVES, who, having derived all these advantages from a gentleman whose munificence was unbounded in the form of expenditure on labour, polled against their neighbour and benefactor, in favour of two adventurers set up by their equally ungrateful priests.

We regret deeply the defeat of a high-minded and honorable man; but we hope the day is not far distant when he will regain his position, and maintain that post which he so worthily filled during his career in parliament. The honoured name of Bunbury will yet be a host in itself, and when the human passions cool down, and the wretched people who were coerced to oppose Captain Bunbury, reflect on their conduct, they will, we venture to say, be the first to cast off the degraded thralldom under which they groan, for that freedom which would be extended to them by such true-hearted Irish as Captain Bunbury.

The priests of Rathvilly Barony have gained a victory over a resident gentleman. The electors were obliged to poll against him in that Barony. The rabble were ready to hoot and insult him—let us see what they will gain by the substitution of a Ball for a Bunbury. We shall see the difference between a munificent country gentleman of ancient standing, and an acreless adventurer, like Mr Ball, late a Poor Law Commissioner.

DISGRACEFUL OUTRAGE.

As the Rev. William Brandon was driving some ladies to the Railway Station at Bagnalstown, on Thursday (the day of the polling there), the crowd near the church first commenced groaning the rev. gentleman, then put out their tongues, and showered them with stones. The car was splintered in two places, but, through a merciful Providence, the clergyman and ladies escaped unhurt, with the exception of one, who was bruised in the chest with a stone.

Is it to be wondered at that the peasantry would be guilty of such brutal outrages when their priests educate them on Sundays from the altar, in their respective chapels, in all sorts of virulence, intolerance, and sedition, instead of teaching them the Gospel of the meek and lowly Jesus? and yet they have the presumption to call themselves the ministers of Christ. What a misnomer!—And such too are the characters that Protestant members of Parliament pledge themselves to educate at Maynooth at the expense of the nation.

PRIESTLY COUNSEL.

[From the Waterford Mail.]

Can it be wondered at that a people should become embruted

to the very lowest depths to which human nature is capable of sinking, when they are addressed in language such as the following, which, we are told by the *Carlow Sentinel*, was addressed by one of the county priests to his flock, from what is termed the altar, but certainly, not one on which, in this instance, the offerings of praise and thanksgiving were offered up. Subjoined are the words, as we find them in the *Sentinel*.

“My good people, mark every man who does not side with your church. Do not work for him. Let him be shunned as you would avoid Satan. Let his tongue be parched, before you give him a drop of water. He shall not enter the chapel; let him worship the devil elsewhere; but let him not cross you in the chapel yard. Canvass them in bodies, and if they don't go with us, drag them out of their houses, and make them go with you. I tell you, the battle is now between God and the devil; and if you don't win, the nunneries will be broken into, the saints of God ill-treated, and your chapels pulled down.”

From the Carlow Sentinel, August 21st.

Attack on the Police at Mass.—On Sunday last two respectable Roman Catholic policemen (Sub-constable O'Dea and Acting-constable Maher, of Kildavin station) proceeded to the chapel of Clonegall to hear mass, as they were accustomed to do since their appointment to the district. On their arrival at the chapel they were met by a crowd, who commenced hooting and groaning, and finally not only prevented them from entering the chapel, but assaulted them with stones, one of which struck Sub-constable O'Dea on the head, inflicting on him serious injury. This manifestation of bad feeling arose from the activity and zeal of those constables to protect the peace, and especially the electors who where previously so wantonly assaulted while attempting to attend their house of worship. On the same day, Michael Kavanagh, a tenant of Colonel Bruen, M.P., was hooted during the celebration of mass, and subsequently attacked with stones. He placed himself under the protection of the constables, who were driven from the chapel, and was by them escorted to the barracks.

LONGFORD.

From the Correspondent of the Evening Mail.

In a recent communication I informed you that Mr. Harman, by the advice of his managing committee, had withdrawn from contesting this county. It now remains to state what was the conduct of the Roman Catholic priesthood after that event. The act of parliament, I believe, requires that the polling-booths should be kept open during the usual period

(two days), if the candidates, without retiring, have been nominated at the hustings. Mr. Harman's resignation was notified the evening before the first day's polling. The priests and their nominee, Colonel Fulke Greville, knew it well. I specify Colonel Greville—for after Mr. Fox's independent and admirable speech on the hustings, he was no longer regarded as such by the supporters of Mr. Harman; and I speak from a knowledge of the fact when I state, that had that gentleman gone to the poll, every Conservative elector who could have done so, without endangering Mr. Harman's success, would have split their vote with Mr. Fox. But what was the conduct of the priests when they saw that opposition no longer existed, and consequently no pretext left for any further use of their hired mobs? Did they dispatch their obedient slaves to arrest the pre-arranged invasion of the county, and, as true ministers of the Gospel would have done, endeavour to calm the troubled waters of a fearful agitation which they had every where evoked? Far from it. Early on the morning of the first day's polling, thousands of ruffians armed with bludgeons, principally from the adjoining counties of Westmeath, Leitrim, and Roscommon, came pouring into the towns of Longford, Ballymahon, and Granard, uttering the most savage yells—many of them in a state of excitement bordering on absolute frenzy. It was computed by the authorities that in Longford a mob of not less than eight thousand had assembled—in Ballymahon some five or six thousand—and in Granard an equal multitude. Had the contest proceeded, who can doubt that a fearful amount of bloodshed would have been the result. Not a friend of Mr. Harman could have approached the polling both, without, perhaps being murdered; and from the insufficiency of the police and military force assembled in these towns, they would ultimately have been compelled, in actual self-defence, as was the case in the town of Clare, to have resorted to the use of the sabre and the musket. But I have wandered from my subject. What did the priests do? Not content with driving Mr. Harman from the conflict—not satisfied with having trampled in the dust every vestige of "the freedom of election," they added insult to injury. No sooner had their barbarous hordes arrived than forthwith these holy men despatched chosen bands of desperadoes, under the command of local leaders, some on cars, others on foot, in every direction, with orders to bring back, by brute force if necessary, every Roman Catholic elector who had promised to vote for Mr. Harman. This task was recklessly performed, and hundreds of unhappy tenants were in this unconstitutional way dragged into the polling booths, and compelled, under the menace of some tyrant priest, to violate their solemn promises. Where, save in unfortunate Ireland, could such impious scenes have been enacted with impunity? In what other region could a body of men be found who, calling

themselves the ministers of religion, whose glorious mission should be "peace on earth, and good will towards men," have proved themselves to be by their deeds the ruthless fomenters of bloodshed, disunion, and crime? Where, in the annals of history, can be found recorded a parallel of the unblushing hypocrisy assumed by these wicked men, in proclaiming that they fought beneath the banners of "civil and religious liberty," whilst instigating ignorant and besotted multitudes to the perpetration of every outrage against all who dared to resist their intolerant tyranny. Years must elapse e'er the remembrance of the murderous deeds of violence, which have disgraced the Popish provinces of this island during the past election, can be effaced from the memories of every peaceful and loyal Irishman.

From the Longford Journal.

Two or three of the priests, as well as Counsellor Stritch, addressed the non-electors out of Higgin's Hotel window, on the evenings of the election week. One of the priests, on one of those occasions, asked if there were any Protestants in the crowd, for if there were, he wished to say a few words to them. "They, (the priests,) were accused of causing this contest, and exciting this mob, but it was not they but dirty Harman that did it. They might thank the priests, or the people (the mob) would cut them up into mince-meat, make sausage meat of them,—and damn'd bad sausages they'd make." Our informant told us that the two Protestant representatives of the county were at the back of the speaker, at the window out of which he addressed the above sentiment.

Michael Fallon, of Clonshannagh, parish of Tarmon, county Roscommon, labourer, was charged with having, on one of the days of the election, thrown stones at the 11th Light Dragoons: he was fined £2 or one month's imprisonment, with hard labour. This blackguard was identified and prosecuted by one of the soldiers, and on being closely questioned by one of the magistrates, as to what business he had in, or what brought him to Longford, he said he was ordered in by the priest.

ULSTER.

DOWN.

From the Downpatrick Recorder.

Our town was literally in a state of seige—invested by thousands of Ribbonmen, who but for the military, would have not only prevented the Conservative electors from voting, but, as Major Nugent observed, deluged our streets with blood. These

men, too, were headed with priests. One priest actually fought in disguise in our street—his fellow-bludgeonists touching their hats to his reverence having led to the discovery. The orders these men received at the Chapels the Sunday before, were to fight, if they should never return! Intimidation! Had not the Conservative electors to be guarded into town by military? Roman Catholics were intimidated, but it was by their priests. They were threatened with eternal exclusion from Heaven, if they would not vote for Mr. Crawford; and if putting them out of the Chapels will keep them out of heaven, the threat will be carried out. In some chapels the seats of Roman Catholics who voted for Hill and Ker, were torn out last Sunday and destroyed.

From the Newry Telegraph.

In truth and fact, to the commanding influence of principle the issue is directly assignable. Priestcraft unwittingly came to the aid of our cause. The element of religious strife was flung, by sacerdotal hands, into the cauldron. But bigotry, like ambition, not unfrequently o'erleaps itself. So it proved in this case—the Romish Priests having ingeniously brought into play,

“A charm of powerful trouble,”

not to the party or the cause intended to be damaged, but to *themselves* and their cause.

Priestcraft aimed at keeping the pass, in this frontier. At an early hour, on Thursday, an organized mob, calculated at somewhat like fifteen hundred, rushed upon the Town from the Hilltown mountains. The gang, well supplied with murderous bludgeons, made experiment the first, upon the conveyances carrying in the voters from Rathfriland and Hilltown, in the Hill and Ker interest. The adventure was something worse than abortive. It so happened that the array of ELECTORS, led on by Thomas Scott, J.P., James Martin McClenahan, J.P., William Beers Lindsay, and Henry Murray, had pluck enough, and power enough, to make head in the face of *any* opposition. But the bludgeonmen—headed by a half-dozen Roman Catholic Priests, and by a young fellow named Baron, son of a Magistrate of the County, and an Assistant Barrister, to boot—found themselves in the lion's den, when they entered Newry.

Flourishing their bludgeons, and yelling, like fiends, for “Sheerman,” the gang rushed towards the polling-booths situate in the leading thoroughfare, terminating at the “Corry Monument.” Captain Warburton, Resident Magistrate, with his wonted energy, was on the alert, and by his orders, the gallant Colonel of the 71st Highlanders presented his brave fellows in serried array on one side; the Lancers dashed on

and flanked on the other, with the Constabulary, under Sub-Inspectors Crawford and Wray—than whom there are not in command of the Constabulary force officers more efficient; and thus were hemmed in the ruffians who came, not to assert the liberty of the subject, but to prevent the exercise of the constitutional right of the subject—not to vote, for even one voter the vile crew mustered not in their array—but to hinder, by physically incapacitating, those who were qualified to vote. Disarmament was the order of the day. The Crawford mob was speedily relieved of knives, daggers, fire-arms—in bulk and quantity justifying the supposition that the sacking of the town was contemplated; and, very properly, inferring the intent from the exposition before his eyes, the Magistrate, officially representing the Executive Government, promptly promulgated the following notification, which perceptibly had an immediate sedative effect:

“NOTICE.—COUNTY OF DOWN —Whereas I have received information, on oath, that it is intended, by force and violence, to interrupt the taking of the poll, at this election, I hereby give notice, that the punishment for said offence is transportation for seven years, pursuant to the statute 35 George 3rd, cap. 27, sec. 12. In consequence of a large mob, several of whom having fire-arms and ammunition secreted among them, and all being armed with bludgeons, having entered the town this morning, Notice is hereby given, that, in case of any outbreak, the authorities are determined to use the most summary means to suppress same, and to punish the aggressors.

“BARTW. WARBURTON, Resident Magistrate.

“22nd July, 1852, half-past 9, a.m.”

The electric shock, thus communicated, operated to an unexpected extent. Against brute force, brought into play by the priests of Rome, moral energy and religious principle, by such a spell conjured, at once stood arrayed. The mob demonstration, the aspect and the war-cries of the gang and of the priests by whom the array was ushered in, availed, to our personal knowledge, to bring over to the side of civil and religious freedom not a few of the thoughtful and long-headed Presbyterians; who, deluded by a mock pretence, had been lured into the camp of the enemy of their church and of their faith.

That enemy was unscrupulous in the use of means. There were every available appliances brought into operation, to corrupt, to intimidate, to coerce. Mill-owners we could name who most liberally offered, to poor and struggling men, the temptation of the bribe, which they attempted to gloss as an “Indemnity.” Obstructions were, in all quarters, placed in the way of free access to the polling-booths. The conveyances bringing the tenants from the Fortescue estate into Newry were

delayed, by substantially-built barricades, erected on the road between the Blackskull and Dromore, necessitating resort to a circuitous *route* of several miles. To a numerous body of voters from Morne—headed by Mr. T. G. Henry, J.P., and Mr. James Coates, J.P.—such interruption was threatened as necessitated recourse to the protective presence of a company of the 71st Highlanders, conducted by Major Hall, J. P. Nor was the intimidation confined to the early part of the day. In the afternoon, the cars conveying homewards the voters from Rathfriland, and Hilltown were set upon above the Hospital; but the waylayers found the *points* presented by the Lancers overpersuasive arguments. Half-way to Rathfriland, another onslaught was made, equally ineffectually. In Hilltown—apparently owing to the fact that the cars bringing the voters from that locality had found shelter at Hilltown Lodge, the Inn being occupied by the troop of Lancers—Mr. W. B. Lindsay was waylaid on passing through the village; but, again, the cowardly waylayers found that manhood might overmatch sneaking treachery.

From the Downpatrick Recorder.

But were these Ribbonmen identified with the Tenant Leaguers? Clearly so. It is the genius of popery to seize upon every new phase which promises to convulse society, and lead to plunder. Many have been revolutionary societies with which Romanists have been connected, differing in names, but possessing the same essential features. In O'Connell's lifetime, they changed like hues of the chameleon. When the rebellion of '48 was exploded, the disappointed rebels threw themselves eagerly into the ranks of the Tenant League, because it promised the same chief object—the property of the country. The guides of the assailants in this case were the would be rebels—now Tenant Leaguers. But the identity of the Ribbon and Tenant League proceedings was made apparent on Monday by the parties themselves. There were, as stated in the report, three parties—one from Saul, a second from Loughinisland (these two Ribbon bodies), and a third, professedly Tenant-right men, from Rademon. When the second party had arrived in town with their “big loaf,” a few of them proceeded to meet the Rademon men, thus showing a previous knowledge of their arrival, and a preconcerted arrangement. When these two parties formed a junction, the Rademon men enquired of the Loughinisland men if the Saul men had arrived; showing a previous knowledge and preconcerted arrangement. The Rademon men had no bludgeons, but, as if to confirm the saying, that “evil communications corrupt good manners,” as soon as they were met by the Loughinisland men, they filled their pockets with stones. There is clearly, then, complete identity

in this case between Ribbonmen and the Tenant Leaguers, There was, also, identity in action. If the Rademon men did not mount the gallery and bludgeon the Conservatives; they did what mischief they could in the lower part of the house. Yet, Mr. Girdwood tells us Mr. Crawford's friends are no party-men! Ribbonmen and not party-men! But take it the other way. Suppose Mr. Crawford's friends are not Ribbonmen, yet they are the men who committed the disgraceful attack upon unarmed and inoffensive individuals. The parties who committed this outrage are Mr. Crawford's friends! He may be proud of them—men who have not a vote among them.

What could have been the objects of the unmanly attack referred to? We think we can see two. The assailants, at the same time, gratified their hatred to Protestants and served their friend. And how did they serve him? Why the intention of those who employed them was to intimidate electors, and prevent them coming forward to the poll.

MONAGHAN.

From the Warder.

THE TENANT LEAGUE—At the summons of the priests, large numbers of the popish peasantry were drafted from the neighbouring counties, to assist in overpowering the Protestants of Monaghan, and upwards of twenty thousand infuriated ruffians were prepared to act at a signal from their ecclesiastical leaders. But so admirably were the arrangements by those entrusted with the conduct of the election, and so firm was the attitude of the Protestant party, that the venture seemed too perilous. There was, indeed, just enough of violence to indicate the ferocious intentions of the popish mob; but they were restrained by prudent apprehension of consequences, and the Tenant Leaguers had to quietly submit to their fate.

From a private Correspondent of the Newry Telegraph.

CARRICMACROSS, July 19.—Yesterday (Sunday) the ultramontane candidate for this county, Dr. Gray, attended the various chapels in this neighbourhood, and lectured after mass. There was no 10 o'clock mass in the town, as the clergy were assisting the Doctor in the country. The 12 o'clock service was hurried over (extra steam put on). The "sermon" was preached by Dr. Gray; after which he started for another Chapel, in the parish of Enniskeen, to agitate. Some whiskey was distributed amongst the town vagrants, who, getting rather unruly, were taken charge of by the police. Will any Presbyterian vote for Dr. Gray—seduced by a word—a mere humbug—"Tenant-right?" No one here understands what it means. It is for

their religion they (the Romanists) are to contend. The Ecclesiastical Titles' Bill—Derby Proclamation, and Stockport riots, form the stock in trade of the agitators here. Tenant-right is for gulling the Protestants.

DERRY.

From a Correspondent of the Newry Telegraph.

The Election for the county Londonderry comes off on Monday, the 19th, and Tuesday, the 20th inst. The excitement throughout the country is very great, but the returns up to the present are in favor of Messrs Bateson and Jones. The opposite party are using every exertion to secure the return of Mr. Greer. They stop at nothing to support their weak and tottering cause. The priests are using every exertion possible in his (Mr. Greer's) favor. Two respectable men were canvassing, on behalf of Bateson and Jones, one day last week, when they were met by a certain priest not forty miles from Moneymore, who asked them were they canvassing for those gentlemen? "Yes," was the reply. "Then," said the priest, "you are canvassing for the devil." Terrorism of every kind is exercised over the heads of every one canvassing or intending to vote for Messrs. Bateson and Jones.

Nor did the priests confine themselves to the exercise of the intimidatory and coercive influence of anathematizing and denouncing. In all parts where there dare be recourse had to positive compulsion, the Roman Catholic Electors, who, under the notion that freedom of thought and action might be asserted in a free State, attempted to emancipate themselves from a condition of spiritual serfdom, were set upon by the bullying priests and their bravoës, and coerced into submission and obedience.

PRIESTLY INTERFERENCE.—The *Derry Standard* says:—

"The spirit of sacerdotal intimidation at elections, which unhappily prevails to so great an extent in the south and west of Ireland, has, fortunately for us, heretofore been little known in the north. It has been reported to us, on trustworthy authority, that at several of the Roman Catholic chapels in the county an order has been read from the altar, directing the different members of the congregation to vote for Mr. Greer. A document, forwarded by Archbishop Cullen to the various Roman Catholics in this county, is stated to be the cause of this unusual movement. At Newtownlimavady on Sunday, the 27th ult., the priest is reported to have stated that the rites of the church would be denied to any Roman Catholic elector voting for Captain Jones or Mr. Bateson. At Dungiven Chapel, on Tuesday, being St. Peter's day, the Roman Catholic

electors were cautioned not to vote for the present members, but to support Mr. Greer; and the order from Archbishop Cullen was read from the altar. At Maheraboy Chapel, the poor deluded people were called upon strenuously to support Mr. Greer, the priest declaring that he would sooner suffer his right arm to be cut off than vote for Jones or Bateson."

DONEGAL.

The polling commenced in the several baronies at nine o'clock on Tuesday morning. It was soon evident that Mr. Johnston, the League candidate, and nominee of the Radical faction, depended for his return principally upon brute force and intimidation.

The voters in the barony of Raphoe were polled in Lifford. At an early hour in the morning the town was filled by most ruffianly-looking fellows, all armed with bludgeons. These scoundrels came from a distance, and were unknown to the inhabitants of the neighbourhood. The first attempt was to prevent the voters of Conolly and Hayes from entering the booth, and in this they would have succeeded, had it not been for the untiring exertions of Robert George Montgomery, Esq., assisted by Sir Robert Bateson, Bart. who headed the constabulary, and kept the avenues leading to the different polling places clear. Sir E. S. Hayes and a large number of voters, on their way to Lifford, were detained for some hours in Stranorlar, surrounded by an immense mob, until the arrival of a body of constabulary, when they were escorted into Lifford. Mr. Johnston, SUPPORTED BY A STAFF OF PRIESTS, appeared opposite the Court-house, when the candidate of the "Catholic Defence Association" delivered an address to the hired rabble, the nature of which may be imagined from what followed. Captain Fenwick, J.P., received a severe cut on the head, from a stone thrown by Johnston's supporters, which prevented him from acting officially, and he had to be conveyed home. Latter in the day, Mr. Conolly was brutally attacked, receiving some severe wounds in the head, after a manly and most courageous resistance. The Rev. William Knox, of Clonleigh, an aged clergyman of the Church of England, was waylaid on going home, and badly beaten about the head. Mr. Johnston, jun. of Woodlands; Mr. Wilson, Solicitor, of Newtownlimavady; Mr. Athill, and Mr. Barney, likewise received various injuries. The Rev. Mr. Fullerton, of Stranorlar, when passing over Lifford Bridge, on Wednesday afternoon, was stopped by the mob, and his hat knocked off by the blow of a stick. Fortunately some persons standing by knew him, and interfered for his rescue, otherwise the consequences might have been serious, as the mob was very violent.

During the rioting the High Sheriff, Thomas Alexander Esq., continued within his lodgings. Whether this arose from timidity or not we cannot say ; but this we are certain of, that the great anxiety of certain officials to appear impartial placed them in the apparent position of partizans of Mr. Johnston. It is most disgraceful to the county Donegal that such rioting was permitted—that a lawless body was allowed to be so long triumphant, and to trample upon all law and order, in the face of the High Sheriff and a numerous body of constabulary.—That Mr. Johnston placed great reliance on the “physical force gentry” to secure his return is illustrated by a fact which is as amusing as presumptuous. When the riots were at their height in Lifford, the would-be representative hastened to the High Sheriff, and besought him to persuade Sir E. Hayes to retire from the contest, and thereby to prevent bloodshed, as he had not the most remote chance of success. On the second day of polling (Wednesday) the voters for Sir E. Hayes and Mr. Conolly had to be conveyed on cars from their residences to the booths, escorted by the constabulary, with fixed bayonets, so great was the intimidation prevalent throughout the barony. Many of the voters for the Conservative candidates were kidnapped during the night of Tuesday, and many more induced, through terror, to violate their pledges, and most reluctantly give their votes for Johnston. For instance, a tenant of Mr. Colhoun’s pledged to vote for Hayes and Conolly, was threatened with death if he did so, and whilst working in the turf bog a message was sent him, that if he did not at once proceed to Lifford and vote for Johnston, his house would be levelled to the ground. This man, in haste and terror, proceeded, in consequence, to the county town, and voted for the League candidate.

It is gratifying to find, however, that such a system of terrorism and lawless intimidation, has proved fruitless.

The polling for the barony of Kilmacrenan took place in Letterkenny. Here, as elsewhere, the voters in the interest of Conolly and Hayes had to be escorted and protected by the constabulary. Two electors on the Conservative side were forcibly dragged off a car, and two more carried away, and compelled through fear, to vote for Mr. Johnston. Some others were kidnapped. The mob paraded the country during the night—in bodies two hundred strong—leaving threatening notices with the electors, and in several instances smashing the houses of the Protestant voters. Thanks to the vigilance of the authorities, who had a strong military and constabulary force present, no serious rioting occurred. In Letterkenny, as elsewhere, the power of the Priests was abortive, and although many were deterred from voting, a sufficient number nobly came forward and placed the Conservative candidates at the head of the poll.

The electors of East and West Ennishowen voted in Buncrana. At an early hour in the morning the roads leading to the town were crowded with multitudes of people proceeding to the election. As their spirits flagged under the fatigue of travelling, they were cheered on by the priests, who occasionally called for groans for all the landlords and agents in the county, which was lustily responded to. Arrived in Buncrana, these desperadoes commenced hooting and groaning the supporters of Hayes and Conolly. Dr. O'Hagerty took a most prominent part in this election, occasionally haranguing the mob. In this he was supported by Priest M'Aleer, of Burt, and several others of the same fraternity. The voters from the island of Inch made several unsuccessful attempts to land on the first day of polling at Buncrana, but were prevented by the fury of the mob. On the second day, the Inch men were brought into the booths, supported by the constabulary. They voted for the Protestant candidates. Many infirm men, however, were deterred from coming up, from the lawless spirit manifested towards them by the mob on the previous day. When the popish party saw that their game was up, on the second day, they became most outrageous. An attack was made on two most respectable farmers. Messrs Lynch, of Drumskeellan, father and son. The former was desperately beaten: but it is gratifying to know that some of his dastardly assailants are known. Four persons have been arrested for this unmanly assault, and are now in custody, bail being refused, owing to the condition of Lynch, Dr. O'Donnell, of Buncrana, tendered his professional assistance to the unfortunate sufferer, and seemed to sympathize with him although himself a supporter of Mr. Johnston. Mr. Baldrick of Buncrana, had Mr. Lynch removed to his own house, after his wounds were dressed, and, like a good Samaritan, paid him every attention. Mr. Hart's Malin tenantry were so intimidated by the lecture they received from the altar on Sunday, that they refused to come to the poll. A man from Clonmany, who voted for Conolly and Hayes, was knocked down after leaving the booth, in presence of a large constabulary force.

As another proof of the system of intimidation practised by the Romish clergy in the district, we may state, that two or three of the tenants of Mr. Young, of Coldaff, were forcibly carried off, and obliged to vote for Johnston. The windows of several other electors, pledged to vote for Conolly and Hayes, were smashed, to deter them from voting as they wished. Informations have, however, been taken against the offenders, and we hope an example will be made of them for such ruffianly acts. Considering that this is the most radical district in the county—that terrorism prevails to a great extent, and that the priests were present, watching every voter, we are only astonished that the Conservative candidates had a majority.

Mr. Conolly, the Member for Donegal, on returning thanks

at the close of the poll, amongst other observations said:— And now, a word to the Roman Catholics, and particularly to the Roman Catholic Priests. [A voice—"The Ecclesiastical Titles Bill."] Yes! as if I was about to address the Roman Catholic priests without being fully prepared to enter into the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill; I will come to that directly. (Hear, hear.) They are, no doubt, a large and important class in this country, and the attitude which they have assumed in this contest, and the violent opposition which they have given me, deserve some remarks on my part. How have I deserved this at their hands? Have I not always, and my father before me, treated them in social life with kindness and consideration? Have I—in my family, my tenants, my dependants—made any invidious distinction on account of religion? Have I ever failed to show to your bishop or your clergy that respect which belongs to their office, whenever they were entitled to my respect? Have I not on all occasions, in the position of a landlord to his tenants, stood upon friendly relations with the Roman Catholics? *I say here, that as far as a true and consistent Protestant could go, I have gone, nay, I will always go, to stand on good terms, aye, as a friend to my Roman Catholic fellow countrymen.* Well, then, what have I done to deserve an opposition of unparalleled heat and virulence? I ask your bishop himself, who knows well the relations of amity and good-will which have long subsisted between me and my Roman Catholic neighbours, not merely here, but also at my other residence; I ask him, why has he countenanced, nay *headed*, this fell opposition against me? Is it simply and solely because I am a Protestant? And now I come to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill. I will enter freely into the reasons which weighed with me in voting as I did in favour of that measure, and I will ask you, Roman Catholics, and you, Roman Catholic priests, who stand here before me, whether I could have done less? I hold in my hand some remarkable words of Dr. MacHale—no mean authority with you in church matters—referring to this question. He says, speaking of the Protestant Church, "*That ex-crescence of Christianity, which disgraces the world.*" That is this meek and Christian Prelate's way of designating the Protestant Church. I find him—himself an Arch-Prelate of your church, presiding over nearly one-fourth of this island—on a public occasion, nay the most public, proposing a member for a western county, using these terms, "*Protestantism that ex-crescence of Christianity, which disgraces the world.*" Well, gentlemen, with that definition thus put forth, would I not in your eyes at least, be insulting the bishops of my own church, and denying the validity of their sacred office, if I were to consent to their territorial titles being conferred by the pope upon others? Do you call upon me then, as an honest and consistent Protestant, to deny my own bishops? Do you, Roman

Catholic priests, who stick at nothing to advance the interests of your own church, call upon me to deny the authority and validity of my own bishops, in order to confer their titles upon the bishops of a church opposed and antagonistic to ours? Have I overstated the case? You know I have not. Nay more, when that bill was before the House, I stated then, as I state now, that if there was any thing in that bill which denied the full and free exercise of his religion to the Roman Catholic, I would vote against it. Well, I ask you, has the Roman Catholic been restrained in ought which concerns his full and entire exercise of religious freedom, by this bill? You know that he has not. I am not so presumptuous as for one instant to think of dictating by what denomination of religion, or according to what school, any man is to worship his Creator; that is too awful and important a question for a fallible fellow-man to decide, and must rest with him whose eternal condition is at stake, between him and his God; but this I do say, that every man should be free to worship according to the dictates of his own conscience, and that this liberty is one of the vital and essential elements of our glorious constitution. That constitution I will defend against all invasion; and although I deeply regret, and I say it with pain, that the Roman Catholic clergy, nay the bishop himself, should have felt himself justified in lending the influence of his position, and the power of your religion, to a violent electoral opposition—though I regret deeply that your office and ministry, and the sanction of your ancient church should be thus employed, yet now, in the hour of triumph, I am willing to forget all, and to join once more, overlooking what is past—to join, I say, once more, my Protestant, Presbyterian, and Roman Catholic countrymen in one bond of brotherhood to promote the good of our common fatherland. Applause.

CONNAUGHT.

SLIGO ELECTION.

AN INCIDENT AT SLIGO ELECTION.

From the Sligo Chronicle.

As there was reason to apprehend resistance, the presence of the Dragoons was required, and these magnificent fellows were following their colonel to the scene of demolition, when, as was said, the heroic Verdon, “came upon the stage,” accompanied by the law agent of Mr. Townley. “Colonel Balders,” said Mr. Verdon, “I command you to return to your barrack—I am chief magistrate.” “I do not know anything about you,” said the colonel; “I have received the requisition of two

county magistrates, which I have in my pocket, and I am prepared to act on it." "Will you obey them, then, before me?" said the astounded Verdon. "I will," was the cool reply. "Return to your barrack immediately," stammered Verdon. "I am chief magistrate;" and here he shook the reins of the colonel's charger. Now, Colonel Balders had fought at Mood-kee and Ferozeshah, and he was not a likely man to be sent to the "right about wheel" by Verdon. "If you don't take your hand off my horse, sir, I'll cut you down." A sudden forward plunge of a charger, and the exceedingly precipitate retreat of a chief Magistrate, followed close at the heels by an English law agent, succeeded these words.

THE PRIESTS AND THE LANDLORDS.

From the Sligo Journal of September, 25, 1852.

In all the chapels throughout the county, the priests appear to have had but one text, "opposition to the landlords." Accordingly from every altar, the loudest, strongest, and most threatening denunciations are heard against any landlord who shall dare to exercise the right of distraining the goods of a defaulting tenant. The priests are, however, we can assure them, "reckoning without their host," for though we know well that the landlords of Sligo as a body are too high-minded to act harshly towards their tenantry, however provoked to do so by the audacious language of an ungrateful and politically unprincipled priesthood, yet we also know that when fit occasion answers, they will not hesitate one single instant in doing whatever may be necessary to maintain their rights. In the meantime we don't find fault with the language of the priests; the worse it is the better, for the sooner the question will come to be decided, whether the laws of the country are to be trampled upon by the priests, or the rights of a free people are to be defended against popish tyranny and priestly violence.

LEITRIM.

From the Sligo Journal.

We regret to state that this county is relapsing into a state of sad disorder. On Tuesday night, over a district extending twelve miles in length, all the hay cocks were tossed in the most wanton manner, and a great many of them set on fire. The same night the pound-keepers house, near Manorhamilton, was broken into, and his firearms carried off. The centre of the mischief is the land called Glenfarn, and the sufferers the respectable farmers who voted for Mr. Montgomery. The

magistrates will, we trust, meet at once, and have the district proclaimed. This is exactly the class of outrages which a proclamation can put down.

CO. MAYO.

From the Connaught Watchman.

BALLINA, JULY 21—PRACTICAL POPERY.—It is a common thing now to see groups of country fellows posted near the shops of Protestant traders, to deter customers from entering. This system of enforcing exclusive dealing has been put in practice in Sligo, Ballina, and other towns. All we can say is, we sincerely trust, the Protestants will not lose sight of such indications, but rise in their strength and overthrow the lawless authority that thus dares to fetter our freedom. We entreat our readers to remember after the election the men who prove faithful to us now, and who are this moment robbed by these artifices. While writing the above our attention has been called to witness these disgraceful proceedings. There are actually, this moment, placed convenient to the door of Mr. Little's establishment, a gang of fellows who shout at, and force every person about to enter his house, compelling them, before our eyes, to walk up the street, and buy what they want at a Roman Catholic shop. Now 'tis useless to comment on such conduct as this. It is eloquent in condemnation of the tyrannous priesthood, who are thus insulting us, and it needs no words of ours to show how entirely repugnant it is to everything like freedom of thought, or manly independence, or Christian principle. Oh! Protestants, and you Romanists that have a spark of feeling left, can you tolerate such infamous doings? Will you not rather record your detestations of such tyranny and such wickedness, and at the hustings join with us in securing the inestimable benefit of civil and religious liberty.

Priest Flannery harangued the electors of his parish at Easky, on Sunday, intermingling the usual amount of twaddle and bigotry with bad temper and bad logic. In all the chapels harangues were also delivered upon the great topic of the hour.

LANDLORDS LOOK OUT.—Deputations, on Sunday, were sent out from Ballina by the priests, through the surrounding neighbourhood, to stir up the people to support the wretched Higginson and his coadjutor, the pauper Bible-burner.

On Monday Ballina was frightened from its propriety by Priest Egan and a large rabble who considerably disturbed the peace. His "riverince" was driven through the town by Mr. Edward Howley, and amused himself exciting his ragged attendants by waving his hat and calling for cheers, &c. Mr. Howley is a magistrate.

THE PRIESTS.

From the Mayo Constitution.

These gentlemen are playing a very desperate game. They cannot surely be so simple as to believe, that they will be allowed to go on in their present career, without a formidable opposition. If they cannot keep themselves quiet, if they cannot be satisfied with the laws under which they live, if they cannot restrain themselves from acting as tyrants among a people who ought to be free, if they will not allow men to do what the laws permit them to do, they will find in the end they will be forced to do it. It is not possible that the people and parliament of England will suffer the priests of the Church of Rome to establish the Inquisition in this country, or to overlook for any length of time such outrageous proceedings as are multiplying around us. The deeds of brutal violence that are fomented by the priests, are becoming so numerous that we cannot afford space in our columns for separate notices of them by correspondents. We are obliged, therefore, to give catalogues containing a brief account of each.

We desire it to be understood, that the outrages which we are about to detail, have all occurred within a few days.

Achill.—For years the long persecution that Mr. Nangle had to bear in this island, had subsided. The people for a considerable time had become most peaceful. The great missionary of the West was hailed with gratitude in every village by the men to whom he had brought civilization and Christianity. His scripture readers were welcomed in almost every house. The utmost good-will existed between the missionaries and the people. That has ceased. The war-whoop again rings through the island. A terrible outrage has been just committed. Do we ask the cause? Dr. M'Hale was recently in the island! We do not say he planned or counselled the deed that has been perpetrated, but he is a man whose tours can be traced through those districts where the reformation movement has extended, by wrecked houses, the bleeding bodies, broken limbs, and fractured skulls, of the poor missionaries. Whether it be himself or some other that kindles these fires of persecution we cannot say, but at all events there is one thing forces itself strongly on our attention, and that is, that his presence and those outrages follow close upon each other.

He comes and goes like the simoon,
That harbinger of fate and gloom;
Beneath whose widely wasting breath,
The very cypress droops to death.

Father Henry has gone to Achill. This is the *genius* who brought himself into notice when he first came into this town by his frantic and uncouth tirades against Mr. Stoney's schools. Afterwards children were beaten on their way to them. It is

the same also, who has left a memorable name behind him for his curious specimens of orthography in the workhouse. It is the same also who had the fight with the soldiers about a girl. It is the same also, who carried about a pair of scissors, and amused himself with cutting the hair off unfortunate females, or as his own elegant orthography would have it—"faymeals." As it has been reported to us, immediately on his arrival in Achill he addressed himself chiefly to the "faymeals," and called upon them to do the work the men had left undone for seventeen years. A few days elapsed, and some scripture readers were nearly murdered, and a schoolhouse thrown down!

Swinford.—It appears Sub-Inspector Church is about to leave Swinford. The local gentry—the majority Roman Catholics, got up, or are getting up, an address to this gentleman. The priest refused to sign it. Why? Because Mr. Church offered a reward of £30 for the arrest of the parties who committed a savage outrage on scripture readers as they were going to church at Keltimogh! We understand every Roman Catholic gentleman in that district is burning with shame and indignation at such atrocious intolerance. In this disgusting conduct we see what the priests demand, and what alone will satisfy them. They require police and all men employed in maintaining "law and order," to stand aside and fold their arms, and not interfere while they hound on their barbarous bloodhounds to mangle those wretched men whose only crime is that they read Bibles! Because an officer does that duty which he could not avoid doing, he commits an unpardonable sin against the priest!

Keltimogh.—Some of the Rev. Mr. Foster's parishioners are prevented, from fear of being murdered, in consequence of certain harangues of the priest, from going to their parish church on Sunday!

Turlough.—There is a reward offered by the police for the conviction of those who burned the house of a man named M'Clean, in consequence of his lodging a poor girl who has become a Protestant some months ago. The house where this girl lived was burned. She is almost daily pelted with stones along the road. Priest Ward met a scripture reader the other day, and warned him at his peril not to go to some part or other of the parish.

The Monastery of Party.—On passing this establishment a few days ago, a shower of stones was hurled at a car on which were the Rev. Messrs. Townsend and Mollon. Mr. Mollen and an infant child, and nurse. Mr. Mollen and the nurse were struck. Mr. Townsend was stoned and hit the day before, when passing the same monastery. He summoned one of the assailants, and at the trial, which took place at Ballinrobe on Monday week, he declared on oath that *he rarely passes that monastery without being insulted and assailed!* and that he can

go through every other part of the country without an unkind word being used to him.

Ballinrobe.—A multitude of people followed two clergymen on Monday week through the streets of Ballinrobe, insulting them and throwing stones at them. One of them was struck on the back, and a boy was knocked down a few yards behind them, by a stone thrown at them. Father Conway, the notorious “verax,” walked about a perch in the front of the clergymen, constantly turning around, and laughing at the disgraceful riot, which did not commence till he came into the crowd. One fellow was arrested by the police for stone throwing, and brought before the Magistrates. He was bailed by Father Conway.

A few hours before and during the trial of a monk’s servant for assaulting Mr. Townsend, this “verax,” planted himself before the witnesses, and was so interfering with them, and so interrupting the court, that Colonel Knox was under the necessity of having him removed.

Such is one week’s report of the movements of the priests in our neighbourhood. Is this to continue, and how long? The government must look sharp after these proceedings, or if not, liberty is extinct in Connaught. We call upon them to teach the priests that they are not prepared to leave the government of this province in their hands, and that they will take measures to force them to be peaceful if they are unwilling to adopt that course themselves. We regret to learn that the same spirit of insufferable tyranny is arising on all sides.

ACHILL PETTY SESSIONS.

From the Mayo Constitution.

At the Achill Petty Sessions, August 27, informations were taken against the Rev. James Scull, and the Rev. James Henry, for an attack on a Scripture reader, and they were sent for trial at the Quarter Sessions.

Magistrates present—M. Singleton, Esq., R.M., chairman; W. Pike, Esq., and D. J. Cruise, Esq.

Edward Coleman *v.* the Rev. James Henry.

This was a summons against the defendant, for that he did, on the 8th of October, 1852, commit an assault on the complainant at Cashel.

Mr. Buchanan said he had hoped from the rev. gentleman having been so frequently before the court, and held to bail on a serious charge, he would not again attempt to take the law into his own hands. If the scripture readers were guilty of any offence the law would afford ample protection; but Mr. Henry preferred exercising summary jurisdiction himself, and committed the assault which would be detailed in evidence.

Edward Coleman examined by Mr. Buchanan—I reside in

Cashel : I am a scripture-reader ; on the morning of the above date the Rev. James Henry, R.C.C. came to my lodging house Owen Gallagher's, just as I was after rising out of my bed ; he stood at the door and demanded of the woman of my lodging house to turn me out ; she replied and said, " come to my husband, he is convenient to you, and let him act as he thinks fit ;" the priest called the husband and told him to turn me away out of his house ; the husband replied, " why should I turn the boy away ? I see he is doing nothing to any person but minding his business, and the times are bad ;" the priest made answer, and said to the man of the house, " turn him away for one week, and if you have not luck at the week's end come to me and I will allow you to take him back again ;" and at the same time taking a book from his pocket, he took his oath that he would rather the man of the house would go to the mountain and steal a sheep or a cow, than have such a devil in his house one night ; the woman of my lodging house made answer, on hearing such expressions from the priest :—" If so, it is equal to me what religion I follow ;" I then made answer and said, " I wish to know from your reverence what enmity or malice have you against me—now is the time to tell me ;" the priest turned about and called me the following names : " you robber, you bastard, you soul-destroyer, you d—d devil, leave my sight or else I shall shortly make you go ;" his manner was much excited ; I then replied that if he were the servant of Christ he must not strive, but be gentle unto all men, apt to teach ; the priest then turned about and took me by the collar of the coat and spit in my face different times ; I bore with all, and replied I would forgive him all he had said and done to me that day, but to discuss any point of doctrine he liked out of his own Bible ; the priest then coming up to me with his clenched fist, and placing his right hand on my face and his left on my collar, pushed me off with both hands ; I bore all and did not push him, or strike, or make him an ill answer ; he then went up to a hillock and began cursing and swearing in the midst of his flock ; I then said it was against Christ's command to be cursing ; then one of the men came running up to me, making an attempt to strike me on the face, but the priest told him not, that he himself would bring a force into Achill that would drive all the " devils" out of the island together ; I then made answer and said the land belonged to Mr. Nangle, and that it would fail him to turn any person out of the island ; the priest then stooped down on the ground and took a wisp of straw in his hand, and said he did not care that much about Nangle or his mission.

Cross-examined by Mr. Henry—I am in the island since 2d of June last ; came from Connemarra ; was born and reared a Protestant ; when I first spoke to you my manner was not excited ; you did spit several times in my face.

Richard Cafferkey examined by Mr. Buchanan—Was at Gallagher's house on the 8th of October; is an Irish teacher; when Mrs. Gallagher saw the priest coming she got afraid, and desired me and some small children that were in the school to go outside the door. (The remainder of this witness's testimony fully supported the evidence of the last witness, including the abominable and disgusting language of the defendant, which is unfit for publication.)

Owen Gallagher (an Irish witness) examined by Mr. Buchanan—I live in Cashel, the day Mr. Henry was at my house talking to Coleman I was in the garden near the house; my wife said to me that the priest wanted me; when I came up the priest said, "I did not see you since I came to the parish, nor speak to you about those people;" he said it was time for me to do something to the men I had inside my house; I told him I had nothing against them, they were mild and quiet coming into the house; their names are Edward Coleman and another; the priest said it was time to turn them out of my house, and not have them any longer; to "put them out now—if you feel their loss in a week's time, greater than if you had them, come to me and I will give you leave to take them back;" the priest then told me it would be better for me to go and kill a sheep, and for my family to eat it, than to have them inside my house; my wife said that it was no matter to a person what his religion was; when the priest made use of that expression Coleman was standing at the door; heard Coleman say to the priest, "here is a Bible, and any place I am going astray show it to me;" the priest and Coleman were then in angry talk, and vexed with each other; they then spoke to each other in English, and I do not know what they said; it was in Irish they spoke to each other up to that time; when the priest and Coleman were talking angrily, the priest gave him a push out with his hand; I heard them speaking angrily in English; saw him pushing Coleman only once.

Cross-examined by Mr. Henry—I am going to church now; I was not born a Protestant; I am a Protestant two years or thereabouts; I am finding out, from carefully reading the Scriptures and from reason, that it is the proper religion, and the best to follow; I do not receive for following that religion as much as the value of a small pin.

Mr. Buchanan—I close for the prosecution.

Mr. Henry being called on for his defence said that understanding that Coleman did not intend to produce the wife of Owen Gallagher, he (Mr. Henry) had met her on the road to-day, and asked her to come here—"I believe," said Mr. Henry "she is now in court."

Mary Gallagher then came forward, and having been sworn, she was examined by Mr. Henry—Recollects the day the defendant was at her house; Coleman and defendant first began

the conversation in Irish ; the priest and she were at the door as soon as each other ; just as he stepped in to call for me I came out ; Coleman was sitting on a chair at the kitchen fire ; when Coleman went out, defendant said to him that he had no dealings with him, and that he only wanted to speak to Owen Gallagher and his wife ; defendant at that time had not the appearance of much anger ; saw no book with the priest ; cannot say whether he had one or not ; the priest put the back of his hand to Coleman to stand out from him ; does not know whether the press of the priest's hand removed him from the place at all : cannot say that the priest pushed him, but that he put his hand to him ; was looking on, but she went up once or twice to the kitchen fire

Cross-examined by Mr. Buchanan—The priest was talking to her, but never about this trial ; the priest was never speaking to her at any time about it ; never had a word's conversation from the time it occurred until this minute ; she met the priest to-day ; he did not speak to her ; he galloped by on his horse ; the priest galloped very fast by her, and did not speak a word, on her oath ; heard the priest say it would be better to steal a sheep or a cow, and live on it, than keep the scripture-readers ; she said to her husband it would be no matter what his religion was if he did that.

At the conclusion of this woman's evidence, Mr. Henry said he wished to explain the discrepancy between his statement and the woman's evidence.

Mr. Cruise—I assure you, Mr. Henry, the bench is most anxious you should do so. You positively told us that you had asked this woman to come here, and she swears you did not speak to her. How can we believe her after that ?

Mr. Henry—I did not speak directly to the woman. I passed her on the road, and sent a man back to her asking her to come here.

Mr. Singleton—You stated positively in the first instance that you had asked her to come here. We will go on with the case.

Pat McCann examined by Mr. Henry—Was present when the priest and Coleman were speaking ; Coleman was abusing the priest ; called him names ; he did not lay his hand on Coleman ; the priest had a book in his hand.

Cross-examined by Mr. Buchanan—Don't remember what the abusive language was ; don't remember any of the bad names ; heard it all, but cannot remember one word ; did not hear the priest swear on the book.

James Gallagher's testimony was similar to the last witness. He underwent a searching cross-examination by Mr. Buchanan, and admitted he had neither house nor land ; slept the night before at the priest's ; he was called father James's man ; drank that day, first at Cashel, and again on the way ; he was

with the priest on the hill, and ran down to Coleman, but did not strike him.

The bench was so disgusted with his manner and conduct that he was turned off the table, being evidently in a state of intoxication.

This closed the defence, and the court having consulted, the chairman, addressing Mr. Henry, said that the bench had hesitated whether they would not send him to gaol, and they had determined that if any further violence of this nature occurred in the island they would positively commit the offending party. The sentence of the court was that Mr. Henry do pay a fine of five pounds.

Mr. Pike said he wished to state that the station at Cashel had been reduced by the removal of some men, and he called the attention of the sub-inspector to it, that the station might be kept to its full number, as it was absolutely necessary.

GALWAY.

Abridged from the Galway Packet.

The nomination of candidates for the representation of the county of Galway in the next session of Parliament, took place this day, in the County Court-house. The High Sheriff of the county, Thomas A Joyce, Esq. Rahasane Park, presided. Shortly before the hour of opening the court the candidates and their immediate friends, and the members of the Press were admitted to the court by a private entrance. The Conservative party occupied the grand jury gallery on the right of the bench, whilst the friends of Bellew and Burke mustered on the opposite gallery, and in the one fronting the bench. At ten o'clock the doors of the court were thrown open to the public, and immediately a tremendous rush was made into every part of the court. On came the crowd, sweeping all before it, like an immense herd of buffaloes in the wild prairies of America. Grand jury boxes, side boxes, and tables were immediately filled amid tremendous shouts for Burke and Bellew, 'down with the Tories,' 'no Daly,' &c. Even our own sanctorum was unceremoniously invaded, and we were obliged to take refuge under the protecting ægis of the High Sheriff, for whose exertions to procure the press accommodation, we must here make our acknowledgements. At this time a desperate rush was made by a party of butchers and others into the gallery occupied by Mr. Daly and his friends.—The gentlemen occupying the front seats were obliged to jump over the rail into the body of the court, in order to save themselves from being pitched over. A dreadful scene of confusion here ensued, the High Sheriff using every exertion to restore order, but to no purpose. For a considerable time the court rang with shouts, hisses, whistling, kicking

thumping, cries of 'no Daly,' 'down with the Tories,' and the most indescribable noises.

When order was, in some manner restored, the High Sheriff observed he would do his duty, and use every exertion in his power to obtain a fair and impartial hearing for every candidate (cheers.)

Counsellor Kelly came forward to propose the first candidate, amidst great cheering and loud cries of 'no Tory,' 'down with the Derbyites.'

The Rev. Mr. Macklin, Roman Catholic priest, came forward to second the nomination of Sir Thomas Burke. Referring to Mr. Daly he asked, who are his supporters here to day? Look at that box yonder, and observe well the medley with which it is filled. A pretty selection of supporters he has made surely! Look at Robert Bodkin, the Catholic, lending his support to the Stockport ruffians who have desecrated the altars and shed the blood of Catholics (groans). Why should he support the men who, if they could, would destroy Catholicity? Is it not too bad to see Daly, the supporter of the Derby government, coming forward, sustained by Catholics—the Tory Catholics of Galway. But he has the persecuting landlords at his back, and they are certainly worthy supporters of such a cause. They ask you to give your votes to the brother of Lord Dunsandle, who signed the petition in support of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill;—of the nephew of Bishop Bob, who moved for the committee of the House of Lords upon Catholic nunneries (groans).

Docter MacHale, in proposing the nomination of Captain Bellew, in the course of his observations, observed, that "no doubt the clergy of Ireland are very much responsible for their share in the result of the contests now waging through the land. They share somewhat the fate of Friar Bacon, who was so far in advance of the time in which he lived, that men looked upon him, to be an accomplished alchemist, because he studied nature."

The candidates then proceeded to address the electors, after which a show of hands being called for, the High Sheriff declared in favour of Captain Bellew and Sir Thomas Burke.

From the Galway Correspondent of the Western Star.

GALWAY, JULY 23.—Yesterday, the nomination of the candidates for the county took place, and long before the Court House was opened, the doors and every avenue leading to it were besieged by the rabble, which, (as I have heard) were hired for party purposes, and who occupied most of the principal places; only those gentlemen who proposed and seconded Captain Bellew, and Sir Thomas Burke could obtain a hearing; and when the friends of the Hon. Robert Daly stood up to propose, and second him, the discordant yells of the mob, prevented a syllable they uttered being heard; with great prudence they deemed it a

wiser plan to withdraw, and not encounter at the outset, the unreasoning enthusiasm of the multitude, as all hope that the voice of reason, or the claims of their country would have been heard by the electors. The Hon. Robert Daly, accompanied by his Committee, and a number of friends retired to the Club House, where after some consultation he came to the determination of withdrawing from the contest. Thus has it ended, and the successful candidates cannot boast that it was by purity of election, or by the majority of votes, that they were returned, but by a party professing liberal principles, yet denying liberty of speech, acting in open defiance of the law of the land, uncontrolled by authority, and setting aside the rules of well regulated societies.

Another display of senseless agitation and mob violence has been given to the world, and in this instance has given an additional specimen of the wisdom which directs all our acts in this distracted and unfortunate country. The very worst passions of the people were excited, and every unchristian element introduced to carry, by force and intimidation, the objects of the selfish and the deeply criminal leaders in this unholy warfare.

In the sacred name of religion this wickedness was carried on in the broad day-light—a brutal and a sanguinary mob, armed with missiles, were hired to assault and insult every one who dared to hold or give expression to a conscientious opinion, even Roman Catholics were subject to this cursed tyranny, as some of the most estimable gentlemen of the country were derisively and scornfully marked out as objects of vengeance to an ignorant and infuriated mob.

To the utter exclusion of every useful measure—of every practical suggestion, connected with the commercial and agricultural interests of this important county, the church took up its place, not for the purpose of advancing religious truth, but for the purpose of spreading religious hatred—not for the purpose of softening down old asperities—but with the naked and avowed object of tearing open the cicatrice, and leaving the jagged wound to fester—not for the purpose of showing Christian forbearance and an obedience to Christ's command to 'love one another' but to perpetuate dissension, and in the name of religion manifest the works of the flesh, by emulations, wrath, strife, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like. All this was apparent to any unprejudiced eye who witnessed the mob power, the mob tyranny, and the ruffianism which refused fair play to an opponent.

Doctor MacHale used his liberty in his lengthy declamation, in which he dealt unsparingly in condemning his political opponents, and in denouncing the Protestant establishment, which he designated 'the excrescence of Christianity.'

We have long and strenuously endeavoured to trample under foot that hydra-headed monster 'party spirit,' which has distracted the people, and led them away from the consideration of the useful objects of life. We freely confess that we never imagined the differences in faith between Roman Catholic and Protestant would ever be altered or changed—but we had hoped from the experience of the last century, when political knaves and sectarian bigots, had fomented division and kept alive religious discord, that the people would see the absurdity and folly of following in the wake of those adventurers who trafficked and fattened upon the disunion and animosities fostered amongst them. We have boldly advocated self-reliance—we have unceasingly sought to draw the public attention to objects of public usefulness—we have endeavoured to pour oil upon the troubled waters, and in the journey of life to make each man regard his fellow, no matter how he worshipped, as a Christian and a brother, but how vain and useless have been our efforts may be judged from the sectarian rancour and the unchristian bitterness exemplified at the hustings, and carried out in every locality of our country during this electioneering agitation.

Dr. Mac Hale told the electors of Galway the other day that only under the following conditions could they make up their minds to vote for any candidate who might support Lord Derby's administration :—

"Do support him, if you wish that Mr. Lacy should send some fashionable official of an Adonis to invade the sacred precincts of the convent, and at any unseasonable hour to examine into the morality of its consecrated inmates (Cries of "Never.") If you wish that your chapels should be wrecked—that your priests should be flung into prison—that the God of Heaven, under the form of bread and wine, should be exposed to blasphemous insult, as He was on a late occasion, you will support Lord Derby's government—(enthusiastic shouts of "No, no.") Gentlemen, if you wish that in this empire every person should enjoy freedom but the God of Heaven, and that every procession should be lawful but the procession of Corpus Christi, in which the God of Heaven is adored—if you wish that he should hide his face, and not be permitted to come out in open day to receive the homage of Catholic millions, you will support the Derby government; and if you wish that those houses of worship which were thronged to suffocation before the famine—if you wish, when those houses are again filled up by the growing population, for the growth of the potato is an emblem of the growth of the people of Ireland, to have them preserved—if you wish to have the foundation-stone of those chapels, which your piety may build up, according to the ritual of the Catholic Church—if you wish to have your bishops and priests wear the

robes of their profession—if you wish that those priests and bishops should not undergo a penalty for violating an unrighteous law, then you will not support Lord Derby.”

MUNSTER.

CORK.

ASSAULT ON THE CONSERVATIVE ELECTORS OF CORK, AND DEMOLITION OF THEIR HOUSES.

From the Cork Constitution.

During Saturday night and Sunday night last large mobs perambulated the city, knocking at the doors of the supporters of Colonel Chatterton, to intimidate them against voting, but the personal violence was reserved for Monday morning. The property and occupancy voters were divided into eight wards, besides a voting place for freemen. They were for the most part placed in public market places, which gave full power to the organized mobs. At eight o'clock mobs of women and men, the former being the most numerous, assembled in the vicinity of each polling place, to assault all those going to vote or returning after voting for Col. Chatterton. To distinguish the voters, the cars which conveyed those in the interest of Murphy and Fagan exhibited large placards, upon which were the words “Murphy and Fagan,” and consequently the occupants of every car not thus distinguished were set upon by the rabble, and beaten with stones and bludgeons. The arrangements for the protection of life and property were certainly the least likely to effect the object, though there were three hundred constabulary, a regiment of cavalry, and two regiments of infantry in the city. The police were all congregated in the different booths, with orders not to leave them, while the military were in large bodies marched through the streets, people being knocked down and seriously wounded, and houses demolished before they arrived at any place where their presence was required. It is wholly impossible to give any idea, not to say a detail of the outrages committed during the day, the city being completely handed over to the mob, while the Mayor and Mr. J. Gore Jones, R.M., who was sent down especially to keep the peace, rode quietly along at the head of a squadron of dragoons. The polling commenced at eight o'clock, and immediately after the rioting took place. Mr. George Smith, of Prince's-street, and Mr. Edward Cleburne, of Great George's-street, were returning from the Harpur's-lane Market, after voting, about half-past eight o'clock. when they were attacked

by a mob of about 500 persons, who flung stones at them and struck them with bludgeons. Mr. Smith ran into a house on the Coal quay, from which he was instantly thrust out by the owner, and was immediately knocked down by a blow of a stone. Having recovered his feet he escaped into a house in Daunt's-square, from which he was subsequently removed by friends, the mob in the interim yelling to have him turned out, until they would murder him. He got several cuts in the head, and a stab of a sharp weapon in the forehead, which was evidently aimed at his eye. Mr. Cleburne, who escaped into another house, was also knocked down, and cut with stones, and one of his front teeth knocked out. Shortly after Messrs. Richard Bradford, William Bradford, Joseph Bradford, and William G. Brndford, when leaving the same booth, were murderously attacked. Mr. Richard Bradford, an aged gentleman, was frightfully cut in the head, and his gold watch and his hat stolen. Mr. William Bradford was also assaulted, and only escaped by getting into a house, while Mr. Joseph Bradford was so pressed by the mob in a house in which he sought shelter that he had to leap through a back window, and effected his escape by scaling the wall. At this time the Rev. George Hinston was assailed in the same booth, and Sub-Inspector Morgan, while protecting him, was severely cut in the face with a stone. Shortly after this Mr. Cross Fitzgibbon, J.P., a 50*l.* freeholder, polled in the same ward, and having escaped from the booth was followed by a large mob into the Grand Parade. Here he took refuge in the shop of Mr. Graham, hatter, when immediately some hundreds of stones were flung at the windows, completely demolishing the handsome plate glass front and a very large looking glass. The amount of property here destroyed cannot be of less value than 100*l.* Shortly after one o'clock the Rev. F. De M. St George. Mr. David Hall, and a man named Richard Clerk having voted, were attacked, and Mr. S. G. French, J. P., having come to their protection with a military party, was himself assaulted and cut with stones. In an information then made by Mr. French, he swears—"After such time any person coming to poll for said Colonel Chatterton could not proceed with safety to their lives." In this ward the windows of R. Evans, South Mall, Mr. Richard Thornton, North Main-street, and several others were battered. While these outrages were committing in the principal streets of the city, similar, if not worse, were perpetrated in the out wards. Few Protestants at all attempted to vote in the Lee, St. Patrick's, Corn Market, and St. Finn Barr's wards. One gentleman, Mr. Richard Newman, having voted in the Lee ward, he was followed by a mob, and escaped into the house of a publican named Keane, on Pope's quay. The house was instantly attacked, and the windows shattered, and the inmates endeavoured to force him again into the streets, but he resisted, assur-

ing them that he would pay for any injury the house sustained. All was in vain, however, for they called on the mob to tear him out. They immediately rushed in, and dragged him out, and commenced striking him, and we cannot imagine how he escaped alive; he was seriously wounded. In St. Patrick's, Mr. Henry Creed, of Knockanroe, was accompanying a man named Thomas Lyons, when they were attacked by a mob, and Lyons was so severely injured that his life is in danger. In the Lee ward Mr. Thomas Good, an Agent of Colonel Chatterton's, was severely beaten, and dangerously cut by stones and sticks. Several electors have sworn informations, detailing the intimidation used towards them, and which deterred them from voting. Mr. Robert Gibson, of the Grand Parade, when about to vote, was surrounded by a mob, crying out, "do if you dare;" and one man presented a knife at him, saying, "do if you dare." Throughout the day the delapidation of houses and the assaulting of voters continued almost uninterruptedly by vast mobs, who perambulated all the streets of the city, dragging people from their houses to vote, and surrounding those of others, to prevent their voting. These outrages, it cannot be denied, are the result of the peace arrangements; which are most effective in allowing the mobs to run riot through the city. To swell these mobs, bands of desperate women, more savage in their demeanour than the most brutal men, were brought in from rural parishes, and over 100 of them took their discharges from the Cork workhouse on Monday morning, and so well did they all execute their order, that even Mr. Fagan, when addressing them in the evening, could not help ejaculating, "glory to the women of Cork! Them are we to thank for our position to-day!" The rioting was so desperate in one of the booths of the Lee ward that the polling was adjourned. The booth will be again opened to-day. As an evidence of the effects of the infamous conduct of our Liberals, out of a list of about 3,029 voters, but about 1,900 came to the poll. Out of these, Colonel Chatterton got 863 votes, Mr. Sergeant Murphy, 1,171, and Mr. Fagan 1,153.

When night set in, large mobs perambulated the streets with bands and flaming tar barrels, attacking all Protestant and Dissenting houses of worship, and the dwellings of Protestants. The windows of Christ Church, St. Peter's Church, Lower Shandon Church, Upper Shandon Church, St. Nicholas's Church, Nicholas School-house and Alms-house, Scot's Church, Free Church, Wesleyan Methodist House, Henry-street; Wesleyan Chapel, Patrick-street; French Church-street Chapel; the houses of the several Protestant clergymen, Ragged School-house, Duncan-street; Wesleyan Preacher's House, Henry-street; Protestant School-house, Blarney-lane; Protestant School-house, Brown-street.

Another account.

Rioting, assaults, and delapidation of houses continued during the evening and up to midnight, while Mr. John Gore Jones, stipendiary magistrate, moved slowly along from street to street with some 2,000 dragoons, infantry, and police, leaving all parts of the city exposed to the outrages of organized mobs, who committed depredations before the arrival of the troops, or after they passed. Even the military and police were assaulted with stones during the day and evening, and no order was given by those who had them in charge to repel their assailants.

The Protestant churches seemed to be specially decreed for attack. The mobs broke the windows in several of them, and tore up the trees in their burial grounds. Even the aged Protestant female alms-houses were not forgotten—that of Blarney-lane was tattered unmercifully.

SCENES AT THE CORK ELECTION.

Described by Col. Chatterton, at the Dinner given to Mr. Butt.

After several introductory observations, the gallant colonel enquired—

Would I have sacrificed my ease, my domestic comforts, my health, to this great cause, did I not see the absolute necessity of it, for the preservation of our country?—did I not perceive the gradual but certain inroads and attempts made by the Roman Catholic priests to gain universal sway (cheers)?

Gutta cavat lapidem non vi, sed sæpe cadendo.

Did I not see their determination, their anxiety, to trample upon us—upon our religion—upon our Protestant institutions, to re-establish their hateful, their intolerant creed—(hear, hear)—their merciless inquisition, and reign supreme in the land—(hear, hear, and vehement cheering).—Great misfortunes, my friends, will certainly and inevitably come upon us if we do not resist and crush this popish conspiracy (loud cheers, and cries of hear, hear). Revert, I pray you, to the late election in the city of Cork. Contemplate with me the frightful scenes there enacted by the Romish priests—(hear, hear)—their acts—their coercions—the expected results of long continued advice—long continued intimidation—long continued misrepresentation—(cheers)—preached from God's altars—converting those edifices, dedicated alone to His worship, into arenas for political harrangues, for abominable agitation (hear, hear, and cheers). Acting under these maddening influences, the populace committed atrocities unheard of even in an uncivilized community, and this at a time, too, when the city was filled with strangers—when a scientific exhibition was open, the chief object of which was to show the nations of Europe that the dawn of civiliza-

tion was beginning to creep over our unfortunate, our benighted country,

Where all save the spirit of man is divine.

(loud applause). Then at the polling places, upon a vote being recorded for me—a fiendish yell burst forth—the unfortunate man became a marked man, and upon leaving the booth was instantly pursued by crowds of infuriated cowardly assassins—human only in shape—(hear, hear)—who thirsted for his blood and destruction, while the paralysed authorities stood coolly by and suffered neither the military nor the police to rescue the devoted victim (loud applause, and cries of hear, hear). Now, sir, if these atrocities had not been encouraged and sanctioned by the Romish priesthood, and permitted by the magistracy, every man would have voted unharmed according to the dictates of his conscience (hear, hear). Had the priests not interfered there would have been no bloodshed.

RESULTS OF THE ELECTION.

From the Cork Constitution.

Some of the friends of Messrs. Murphy and Fagan, not content with the breaking of heads and of houses by their mobs during the election, have since been exhibiting their "orthodoxy" by withdrawing their dealings from Protestants. The lower class has followed the example of "their betters," and a poor woman of—— but perhaps we had better withhold her name—has been hunted out of the Grand Parade Market, where she earned a livelihood by the sale of vegetables. She was the only Protestant who sat there; and the women her companions, most of whom, we doubt not, depend on Protestants for the greater part of their sales, were notorious for their violence during and before the contest, and pursued Colonel Chatterton, with cries of execration on his passing through the market on the day of nomination. Protestants are not allowed to go to and from their places of worship, without indications of the evil spirit which the priests and their auxiliaries called to their aid. Ladies, the most inoffensive, are made to feel the inconvenience of professing a Scriptural creed. On Sunday a lady was leaving the evening service at St. Finn Barr's with her children, when one of a number of ill-bred young ruffians, remarking a Bible in the hand of one of the little girls, exclaimed, "What impudence that one has carrying her Bible! Ah! we'll soon burn you, your Bibles, and your churches too!" and forthwith a volley of stones was poured after the mother and her affrighted children. It is bad teaching and bad training, but what can we expect? "By their fruits ye shall know them." "Do men gather figs of thistles or grapes of thorns?" No, no! and when three priests were seen leaping like satyrs, with the fiend in their faces, before the mob in George's-street, fra-

ternising with wretches that disgrace the name of women, slapping them on the back, and hounding them on in their unholy work, with an ardour which induced a gentleman to call the attention of all in the large room of the Hotel to witness a scene which they might never elsewhere have a chance of observing, what can we look for but disciples worthy of their master? Until the whole breed are reformed or restrained, it is folly to hope that Ireland and her people will be better than they are.

TIPPERARY ELECTION.

From the Nenagh Guardian.

The Rev. Mr. Bowles, R.C.C. of this town, came forward and addressed the assembly, at much length, he was followed by Mr. T. Fitzpatrick, who went on to show that Captain Otway had no pretensions to be associated with the late Robert Otway Cave, who was in no way connected with the bloodhounds of the Ormonds. They had seen what those bloodhounds had done, how they made a desert of the most beautiful and fertile portion of Ireland. Father Scanlan, of Cloughjordan, said they had many liberal Protestants with them, but there was one man whose life he saved twice, at great personal risk to himself—and that was Mr. Geo. Garvey, who he now heard was coercing tenants to vote against their consciences. The Rev. Mr. Maher, of Toomavara, said that any one that would vote for Capt. Otway was a recreant to both his religion and his country. Any Roman Catholic who would vote for Captain "Josler" could not put his hand on his heart and say he was an honest man—he could not go on his knees in the sight of his Maker and say he was innocent of crime when he voted for Captain Jocelyn Otway !!! When they saw the present Derby government forcing a candidate upon the people, it was their duty to come forward and oppose that candidate by all the means in their power. After some further remarks he concluded by stating that if any one were found base enough to vote for such a candidate the term "Darby," as he said on the last day he addressed them, *should be branded over their kidneys*, but if any person is now sorry for making a promise to him, *I absolve him in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost !!!* The Rev. Mr. Scanlan, P.P. of Bourney, next presented himself, he said the man who would vote for Captain Otway, was a traitor to his country of the deepest dye. Parties had been going about saying, "Give one vote for Otway and another for Scully." This was a shameful course—there could be no mincing the matter—there could be no such thing as one vote *for God and another for the Devil*—which would be the case as was so cunningly suggested—one vote for Scully and another for Otway. The Rev. Mr. O'Brien, of

Lorrha followed in a long oration. 'Thus ended these "*monster*" meetings.

PRIESTLY PLACARDS.

Tipperary has treated us to another specimen of sacerdotal literature. The priestly penmen of that county throw the "cunning hands," of Cork into the shade.—The following is the latest exemplification of their love for "civil and religious liberty" with which they have favoured us. Like its predecessors, it has been, "industriously and extensively circulated all over the country," and no doubt received the desired response from the "most moral and religious people in the world."—They are just the people to sympathise in such things with their tolerant and Christian teachers!

SLAUGHTER OF ROMAN CATHOLICS.

Men of Tipperary read this!—The bloody bigots of Stockport, urged on by the Derbyites, attacked the innocent children of the Roman Catholics, when quietly leaving their schools, and followed them to their homes, and flinging them from the windows into the streets, and butchering them and their unoffending parents, wrecked and destroyed their houses and furniture, destroyed the two Roman Catholic chapels, burned the organs, vestments, and all their sacred furniture, wrecked the houses of the priests, destroyed their libraries, which cost £800, and trampled on the most Holy Sacrament of the altar.

Will you vote for Jocelyn Otway, a supporter of the Derby Government, that sanctions this?

Will you vote for Jocelyn Otway, a supporter of the Orange Government, who will hang and transport all your bishops, priests, and nuns?

Will you vote for the villains who are swimming this moment in the blood of your Roman Catholic brethren, and making bonfires of your chapels?

Will you vote for the bloody Derbyites, who say there can be no peace for Ireland until Popery is extirpated?

Will you vote for the devils, who are burning every image of the Crucifixion, and of the Holy Mother of God, that they can lay their hands on?

Which will you follow, Christ or anti-Christ?

Choose at once—will you vote for Jocelyn Otway, and bring down heaven's curse on yourselves and children?

Vote for Scully and Sadlier.

Vote for the true soldiers of your creed and country, who will help the Irish Brigade to trample on the Derbyites, the persecutors of your religion.

The *Clonmel Chronicle*, from which we copy the placard, says—"The brain from which it emanated, and which guided

the hand that wrote it, would, we are certain, direct the same hand to the throat of his neighbour."—Not a doubt of it, or, if it found the neighbour "napping," throttle him itself. However, as it is said before, there is wisdom to be gathered from these things, if our statesmen know but how to seek it.

Election placards are privileged publications. Let our readers judge whether the following poster, which has been set up on the doors of the chapels throughout the county Tipperary, comes within the range of the allowable freedom of the press:—

"HELL BROKE LOOSE!"

"The demon of persecution is up in England. Bloodshed, Sacrilege, and fire, have commenced the Reign of Terror. Roman Catholic chapels have been demolished—those who worshipped there have been butchered; but more horrible than all, the Sacrament of Redemption—the Body and Blood of the Saviour has been violated and trampled in the mud! Hell has opened and belched forth armies of devils to desecrate and murder. This is the work of the Derby Government, who drew the sword against the altars of Christianity, and who, if they can get power to do so, will not leave one of them in these United Kingdoms.

"Up Irishmen for the Old Faith! Link your strength around the sanctuary. This is no time for cabals or feuds. Who would place his hopes in the smiles of an Orange Landlord, while the Holy God of heaven spreads forth His arms to shelter the faithful defenders of his church? Who would support Jocelyn Otway, the supporter of Derby and his Hell-crew? Who would vote for Jocelyn Otway, that wants to go to Parliament to help in the destruction of the Catholic church? The traitor who will do so, never let him enter a chapel door. Let his memory be to you like the memory of Judas. Keep from him, for the devils of hell are his companions; and no saint in heaven will pray for him in his dying hour.

"VOTE FOR SCULLY AND SADLIER."

"Do your duty to God and man, and trust in him alone who can defend you, who can wither in a moment the hand that would attempt to strike you in persecution.

"HURRAH FOR THE BRIGADE."

The way in which the priests are working for their candidates may be judged from a copy of a placard which they have posted through the country. The police, indeed, have in some places very properly torn the postings down:—

ELECTION OF TIPPERARY.

Lives there a slave so lowly,
Condemned in chains unholy,
Who could he burst his bonds at first,
Would pine beneath them slowly?

Freeholders of Tipperary, now or never !
Scully and Sadlier,
 Tenant Right and Altars Free !
 Or, a Repetition of the Stockport Sacrilege !
The Chapel Demolished !
 The Sacred Utensils of the Altar Profaned !
The Priest's House Levelled,
 And his Books (value £800) flung into the streets, by the
Walpoles, Drummonds, Jocelyn Otway,
 And other Earth Stoppers of the
Derby Priest-Hunting Bloodhounds !
 Whose yelp is again heard in the Kennel of the Ormonds.
 Vote for Otway and his Gutter Agent, and you support the
 descendants of men who
Transported one Priest ! ! !
And hanged Another.
 Jocelyn Otway beware of the
Ghost of Father Sheehy !
 Toler, take Care of
Father O'Meara ! ! !

From the Nenagh Guardian.

In all the booths we had the supreme happiness of witnessing lots of priests. There were three or four young ones stationed in each, sitting like so many ravens, watching for live carrion that came up to vote, and seeing that not a morsel of it went astray ; whilst in the booths, and about the precincts thereof, were marching up and down, and conversing with the voters, and to every spooney these simpletons (?) could get a word out of the *timbers* out of which the future pillars of the church are to be constructed ; and then we had the " old boys " acting as gutter agents and tallies-men, bringing in and bringing up their voters ; but one of them, being more zealous than wise in his generation, spoiled all by exhibiting A LARGE CROSS ON HIS HAT, which very act of his VITIATES THE ELECTION OF HIS FRIENDS. Also during the day, altho' the sheriff's proclamation forbade, and strictly prohibited them from being exhibited, there were banners and bannerets exhibited even out of the Brigadiers' Committee Room windows. There was also music, although prohibited, exhibited on this occasion. Our clerical friend, Father Meany, was seated on one of *Brian Cooney's* long cars, with a rheumatic piper behind him, conveying a cargo of voters to the committee rooms of Messrs. Sadlier and Scully, and amidst the cheers of the crowd, the piper was playing his reverence's favourite song, " The low-backed car." The rev. gentleman subsequently acted, like all his compeers, in the part of gutter agent, and brought up his men to " the pole (?)

LIMERICK.

Monday night—The 3rd Dragoons and Infantry were pelted with stones, and severely injured by the female portion of the

mob, which amounted to at least 20,000 persons favourable to the Roman Catholic candidates, Sergeant O'Brien and Mr. Potter. Five of the dragoons were unhorsed, and two officers wounded in the face by missiles hurled at them. There are thirteen persons under treatment at Barrington's Hospital, consequent upon the conflict. The court was opened at half-past ten o'clock, when the candidates and their friends were admitted to the galleries. To depict the scene would at this moment be impossible. Benches, bars, and seats, were torn up by the mob in the liberal interest, and hurled with tremendous violence at Mr. Russell and his friends, several of whom were cut and wounded. A man was flung from the gallery, and spiked on the rails beneath.

Mr. Russell was proposed by Mr. Howley, and seconded by Mr. Robert Hodger.

Sergeant O'Brien was proposed by Mr. Monsell, late M.P. for this county, and seconded by Rev. John Beahan, P.P. St. Mary's.

Mr. Potter was proposed by Counsellor Devitt, and seconded by Mr. Richard Raleigh, tobacconist.

Not one word could be heard from either proposers or seconders, and the candidates at either side were not allowed to speak a word.

This evening the windows of every Roman Catholic in Limerick, promised to support Mr. Russell, were shivered to atoms by the mob, and military and police are in requisition in all quarters.

Tuesday night—The excitement throughout the city continues unabated. Last evening the mob traversed all quarters in search of such of the Roman Catholic electors as were pledged to support Mr. Russell, and used such intimidation as to cause many to give way through terror, rather than sacrifice, not only their property, but the lives of themselves and families. Lieut. Knatchbull, 3rd Dragoon Guards, was one of the officers badly wounded in the conflict yesterday. Mr. Barron, stipendiary magistrate, was also struck, and Mr. Russell, brother to the candidate, was knocked down and maltreated.

The mob gutted the residences of several respectable electors. This day they visited the Liberties to intimidate the voters, but were repulsed by the military. Two field-pieces of artillery were called into requisition, in addition to the force, and the magistrates held a meeting, the result of which was the publication of the following :—

“Public notice—Any person found collecting together or assembled in masses, and parading the streets, shouting and intimidating the peaceful inhabitants, stone throwing, breaking windows, or in any other manner conducting themselves with violence, or acting, so as to lead to a breach of the peace,

shall be immediately dispersed, and the rioters taken into custody and punished according to law. It should also be generally known that any person or persons found throwing stones at the military or police from the windows of houses or premises, such houses or premises shall be immediately taken possession of, and the occupier held responsible, and such use made of the premises as may be deemed essential for the safety of the public."

Attack on the Military at Six-Mile-bridge—Six Persons killed on the spot ! and seven seriously wounded.

A violent and fatal conflict took place at Six-mile bridge, (one of the polling stations of the county Clare) on Thursday last, between the excited peasantry and a detachment of the 31st regiment, under Captain Eagar and Lieutenant Hutton, while on special duty escorting voters to the poll.

It appears that owing to the intimidation held out against the tenantry of the Marquis of Conyngham, residing in the neighbourhood of Meelick, and whose votes were solicited for Colonel Vandeleur, it became necessary for their protection to bring them into Thomondgate, on Wednesday night, where they were provided with lodgings. Next day cars were provided, and the electors, under escort of the 31st, left for Six-mile bridge, Mr. John C. Delmege, J.P., having command of the military, who before moving off were ordered to load their firelocks. On approaching the village an immense mass of country people were congregated so as to intercept the progress of the electors and military, who, upon entering the town, were assailed with groans, and rudely assaulted with stones, and other missiles. In vain did the officers and men remonstrate with the infuriated people to give way, and forbear violence. Stones were hurled at the escort from every direction, their caps were knocked off, muskets broken, knapsacks stove in, and several of the detachment were cut and injured. This outrageous attack was no longer endurable. The soldiers got off the cars, and formed two sections of ten men each in front and rear of the vehicles upon which the electors were seated, and who were equally exposed to the vengeance of the mob. The escort pressed on in the direction of the courthouse, where a simultaneous onslaught was made. Captain Eagar received a violent blow from a stone on the side of the head, while thirty men out of the party were cut and bleeding, their uniform and accoutrements spotted with blood.

Exasperated by such vile usage, and their lives in imminent danger, the soldiers in the advance section, fired upon the assailants, when six men were shot dead, and as many more badly wounded. Terror and dismay now seized the rioters, the moans of the wounded, and shrieks of relatives and friends resounding from the town, and responded to from the fields.

Corporal Marshall. 31st, one of the escort, was brought into barracks dangerously wounded, and is now in garrison hospital, suffering from the injuries inflicted on his person by the rioters.

From the Limerick Chronicle.

The unfortunate event at Six-mile-bridge occurred whilst Mr. John C. Delmege, J.P., had gone to the rear of the line of cars in order to quell the attack made there upon the voters, and before he had returned to the front the shots were fired by the military; but notwithstanding all the vigilance used to protect Colonel Vandeleur's voters, many of them left Six-mile bridge without being polled; some were dragged away, and some stole away in fear of their lives, after being wounded, and who, if they had been polled, would have given Colonel Vandeleur a majority of several votes over Mr. O'Brien. The attacks of the mob upon the electors under escort were of the most awful kind ever witnessed, so that the poor men who ran away to save their lives were not to be blamed. The crime of Mr. Delmege was having liberated seventeen electors who had been locked up in a house in Thomond-gate. These men had assembled at Mr. Goggin's, Burton-hill, in order to go under protection to Six-mile-bridge, but Mr. Goggin's house was broken open by a large mob, and the electors forced away and locked up at Thomondgate, until Mr. Delmege and his party released them.

At the inquest held by the coroner—

Mr. White, police constable, deposed that he was on duty outside the court house on the day of the polling, and saw the firing; I heard Father Clune say, "Boys, they are bringing voters in on cars from Limerick, and ye are standing here idle," there was then a general rush of people around the corner into the lane; I didn't see him again until after the firing; the firing took place in three or four minutes after the crowd went into the lane; when next I saw Father Clune he was near the soldiers at the court-house.

Mr. George Studdert was next sworn—A few minutes before the firing commenced he saw the Rev. Mr. Clune come up opposite the court-house from the direction of Miss Wilson's residence, and addressed the crowd that was standing there; there were one hundred persons assembled before the court-house, when Rev. Mr. Clune addressed the people, and he saw him make gestures and signs; he was standing opposite the court-house, a few yards from the corner of the lane; he appeared very much excited; after he made signs the people rushed round the lane; in a couple of minutes after they ran into the lane; I heard the firing; he said to the people, "Shame, shame, boys; is there a man among you, or is there a man by me?" I am not sure which he said; he added, "Here are the voters

from Cratloe coming in on covered cars, go, go," said he, waving his hand, and pointing in the direction of the lane.

Lieut. Henry Hutton, 31st Regt., sworn—I am nearly nine years in the regiment; served with the regiment in India, and was in active service; I have been in four general engagements and an affray; I was with the party that left Limerick with voters for Six-mile-bridge on the 22nd July; we met at Wellesley-bridge, and took up some voters there; we came on cars to Six-mile-bridge; when we came into the village the soldiers got off the cars; the right subdivision fell in front, and the left subdivision in re-re; they formed into sections of ten men each; twenty in front, twenty in re-re, and I extended one of my sections of ten men from the re-re to the right, along the sides of the cars; I know a section of the right subdivision extended along from the front, so as to form a similar line: my party was behind the last vehicle; we first met an assemblage of persons about the bridges; we continued our route straight on towards what I now know to be the Chapel-green, on from the police barrack; there were a great number of people collected there; we were received with hooting and groaning; the people followed us, and almost immediately commenced stone throwing: it continued without intermission on to the chapel; the mob pressed on us very much; I spoke to them several times by way of remonstrance, but they only went on worse; they called the voters convicts, and the priest came up and said, "Oh, my God, to see those of our own religion, our flesh and blood, treated as convicts;" I heard it said generally, "pull the voters off the car," but I cannot say the priest said it, but I should say undoubtedly he heard it; while this was going on the character of the stone throwing was very violent; unquestionably the Roman Catholic clergyman must have seen the stone throwing; it continued to increase all the way to the lane: it was worst about the chapel.

From a London Journal.

The result of the inquest at Six Mile Bridge has left no room for doubt, that where Popery is rampant, neither freedom nor order can exist. A fourteen days' inquiry has elicited, through all the hard swearing of popish priests and their witnesses, the following undeniable facts. On the day of polling in the Co. of Clare such was the turbulence of the crowds excited by the inflammatory harrangues of the priests who marshalled them whip in hand, that electors intending to vote for the candidates opposed to the nominees of the priests could not, without the protection of the military, approach the polling place. Under these circumstances a body of electors proceeding to the polling place under a military escort, were waylaid by a large mob under priestly command; attempts were made to seize the voters; and the mob, adroitly divided into two bodies, closed in upon

the military in a narrow lane, with the evident intention of overpowering them. Stones were thrown in heavy showers, and several soldiers knocked down. Such was the confusion, and extremity of the danger, that some of the soldiers at last fired without orders, in self-defence, and those who were in a position to communicate with their officer, upbraided him for "allowing them to be murdered without firing." A number of the rioters having been killed by the discharge of musketry, an inquest was held, and the verdict of the jury under priestly influence is—contrary to the evidence which, when properly weighed, clearly establishes a case of "justifiable homicide"—contrary to the coroner's charge, who distinctly laid down that "manslaughter" was the only other verdict they could find—"wilful murder" against a magistrate who neither fired nor gave orders to fire, and against such of her Majesty's soldiers as fired in pure self-defence.

Where such things can happen; where electors cannot give their votes except at the risk of their lives, and under the protection of the military; where the appearance of magistrates and of the Queen's troops is unavailing to preserve the public peace; where the most treacherous and cowardly manœuvres are resorted to for the purpose of disarming and crushing the public force; and where, when the public force is compelled to have recourse to active measures of repression in self-defence, a jury can pronounce the sufferers out of a lawless mob, innocent victims, and the Queen's officers and soldiers defending their lives while in the lawful execution of their duty, murderers—where, we say, all this can happen, and carry with it, as it does in the county of Clare, the assent and consent of the great bulk of the population, there freedom is simply impossible. To enfranchise hordes of priest-ridden savages like those who constituted the mob at Six-mile-bridge—and similar mobs at all the elections in the popish parts of Ireland—is to enslave the civilized portion of the community, and to entomb freedom itself beneath the ruins of society. The measure of priestly license and iniquity is full, and the day of retribution is at hand.

The opinion of the *Times* on this affair is thus expressed—

"If ever there was a positive and heinous crime committed in the three kingdoms it was the attack directed against the Queen's troops by the leaders of the Six-mile-bridge mob. Whatever the result of that attack may have been, and however scandalous a mockery of the forms of justice may have taken place at the subsequent inquest, the original offence remains the same. Whether the soldiers are to be prosecuted for murder, or the witnesses for perjury, and whatever may be the result of either of those proceedings, it would appear abundantly clear that the first cause of all these offences re-

mains untouched until there has been a solemn inquisition into all the circumstances connected with the outrageous assault upon the division of her Majesty's 31st regiment, when they recently marched into Six-mile-bridge in the discharge of their duty.* We have the word of the two officers in command of the division, and of many of the men of whom the division was composed, as to the actual occurrence of a formidable riot, in which they were assailed, without a shadow of provocation, by a numerous mob, led on, as it is said, by one, if not by two, Roman Catholic priests."

"TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

"Sir—One of my tenants, James Dillon, of Parklough, who resides in the Six-mile-bridge district, and who at my request plumped for Colonel Vandeleur at the last election, was dreadfully beaten on Sunday night last, by an armed party, for his having so voted.

"The pews and chapel seats of other electors were broken up and thrown outside the chapels on the same day for the same cause.

"A gentleman, Mr. William Kenny, who had his face scraped by a fall from his horse, and who, in consequence, was unable to go to the polling place to vote, was, since the election, held up to the congregation in most blasphemous language, as an instance of the special interposition of the Almighty to mar his intention of voting against 'his God.'

"Armed parties have, since Saturday last, patrolled the Spancil-hill and Crusheen districts, and have broken open many houses, and carried off their guns from five several well-disposed inhabitants.

"Stones were flung on Monday night at two magistrates who were returning from dinner at a friend's house in the same neighbourhood.

"In fine, the social system is broken up in Clare and in other counties, and the country must be abandoned to the priests of my persuasion, or British legislation must speedily interfere to protect the well-disposed Roman Catholic subjects of the Queen in the exercise of their civil and religious rights.

"I have the honour to be yours, &c. PIERSE CREAGH,

"4 Mountjoy-sq. South, Dublin, Aug. 11."

Sunday morning last, written notices were posted at Courtbraek, denouncing by name, upwards of twenty voters in the townland of Ballykeefe, who had polled at the Limerick city

* The view taken by the Judges in sending both Mr. Delmege and the soldiers for trial, appears to us most extraordinary. If Mr. Delmege gave the order to fire, what blame could possibly be attached to the soldiers? If the soldiers fired without Mr. Delmege giving any order, what blame could attach to him? One or other must be guiltless.—P. D. H.

election for Francis William Russel, Esq. M.P., and holding them up to public execration as rotten papists."

It is thought that the riotous excesses of the fanatic mob, who were excited to outrage, at and after the recent election, will lead to an imposition of £2,500 additional upon Limerick, by Grand Jury presentment next assizes, every shilling of which will fall upon the householders, to compensate all those whose premises were wrecked, and whose property was destroyed.

From the Limerick Chronicle.

We (*Limerick Chronicle*) do feel surprise, and more—regret at the unexpected removal of the 31st from this garrison, a regiment of such eminent character and resplendent service, dating from the battle fields of the Peninsula to the burning sands of Hindostan, where their gallantry and humanity were equally conspicuous. The citizens of Limerick know too well the advantage in a worldly view of having a battalion of 800 to 900 men, officers, band, and regimental staff, quartered in this garrison, whose expenditure with shopkeepers, tradesmen, and mechanics, necessarily amounts to a considerable sum in the year. We remember well the deep umbrage felt here a few year since, when the garrison force was reduced from two infantry regiments, besides cavalry, and artillery, to headquarters only of a regiment and a skeleton depot. That, indeed, was a sad transition from the "pride, pomp, and circumstance" of military parade, field days, and martial music, of which all our fellow-citizens are so passionately fond. We then responded to the public feeling, and by energetic remonstrances on the indignity, as well as injury accruing from so impolitic a change, happily succeeded not in augmenting the strength of the garrison, but in securing to Limerick the headquarters of a district command, which, with General, Adjutant General, Quartermaster General, and Staff, it was really intended to annex to Cork! We cannot forget how long and earnestly has the town of Galway supplicated the Commander in Chief even for one regiment in that town, because the inhabitants are sensible of the social and financial profits of such a connexion. The conduct of the 31st in this garrison has been soldierlike and exemplary, until the fatal affray at Six mile-bridge with a small detachment of the regiment, excited a feeling of animosity against all the men. It is a remarkable fact, that of the escort then assailed upon a most arduous and responsible duty, only two were Protestants, the remainder being all Roman Catholics, and most of them "Tipperary boys." Is not this one elementary feature quite sufficient to efface the supposed crimson hue of Orangeism falsely applied to the 31st? What is there to palliate, under any circumstances, the attacks

of vulgar street ruffians, upon individual soldiers returning to their barracks in Limerick before tattoo, almost every evening for the last week? The Duke of Wellington is not the man to suffer the sworn defenders of their Sovereign, who wear the same uniform with himself, to be thus hunted down under the eyes of the civil and military authorities. Should those cowardly, insulated attacks be repeated, an order will issue for the military to carry side-arms, as heretofore, for their protection when off duty, so long as they may continue in this garrison. It is now, therefore, time for every respectable citizen to exert his influence for the restoration of good feeling with the military. Limerick cannot afford to lose a large garrison. It is a matter of perfect indifference to the 31st whether they remain or not. Many a town will be glad to receive them. If they are removed, the injury will be to ourselves, and the injustice to a regiment that never deserved reproach from the loyal and peaceable subjects of their Sovereign in any part of Great Britain or Ireland. The 31st are under orders for Fermoy, to be replaced by a depot, which will withdraw an expenditure of at least £250 a week from this garrison.

SOLEMN OFFICE AND HIGH MASS FOR THE MEN SHOT AT SIX-MILE-BRIDGE.

From a London Paper.

The wretched beings who fell at Six-mile-bridge, in a savage assault upon the Queen's troops, have been admitted to the most solemn honour of martyrdom by the priests of the district in which they fell. Yesterday week, we are told by the Irish papers, a solemn office and high mass were offered up for the repose of their souls. Priests mustered from all quarters to sanction this shameful profanation.

It is impossible to represent this as the performance of a mere ordinary ceremonial. It was intended as a special honor and a special benefit to "the slain." It was the accordance to these unfortunate victims of evil counsel of the form and ceremony with which the Church of Rome honors the memory of those she deems entitled to signal respect. It was designed to teach the crowds who attended the ceremonial the lesson that these men had died in a righteous cause. It was for this that the priests of a whole district gathered themselves in troops. It was for this that these men presumed to offer up in sight of an excited multitude that sacrifice, in which they dared to say that they held in their hands the actual body of our Redeemer. We almost shrink from writing down the record of the profanation. Yet if these twenty-seven priests did not regard this "solemn office" as a solemn cheat, they believed that on that desecrated altar they brought the actual and corporeal presence of the Redeemer of mankind, to do honour to the obsequies of

men who met their death while engaged in an assault, of all others the most savage and most cowardly—that of throwing stones at unoffending men. This awful impiety, be it observed, was the work of no single fanatic, whose rash and unauthorised acts the great body of his brethren can disclaim. It was the conjoint act of all within reach. Nothing was wanting to stamp it with authority and with deliberation—P.P.'s and V.G.'s swelled the throng. If the bishop was absent in body, he was, it seems, present not only in spirit but in purse. After the ceremony a Rev. Mr. O'Mahony handed in £5, as the subscription, to the relief of the widows and orphans, of "the Lord Bishop of Killaloe," and assured the meeting "that no one felt a deeper sympathy with the bereaved widows and orphans of this deplorable and causeless massacre." We pass by the indecency of this attempt to enrage popular feeling against men who are to be tried. But why, let us ask, this sympathy on the part of the bishop and his priests? It is to teach the people that these men have fallen when doing the work of the church. It is to inculcate upon the living the lesson that when they rush like savages upon voters, batter in the skulls of soldiers with huge stones, they are, in the eyes of the church, doing God service. This is the moral of the solemn office and high mass. If such be the priests, can we wonder at the people? If such be the teaching, what other fruits can we expect than those of turbulence and outrage? Talk, indeed, of the finding of "wilful murder" by a jury summoned at hap-hazard from the most ignorant of the class exposed to the influence of such exhibitions! the "causeless massacre" of the bishop is literally translated into "wilful murder" by the jury. Neither is to be justified by the law of Queen Victoria; but there is a law which this bishop has sworn to enforce—the canon law of the Pope, which teaches that persons executing the commands of heretic magistrates or sovereigns against those engaged in the service of the church, are guilty of murder if they take life. This is the law which was most solemnly taught in the "solemn service, and high mass"—this was the law which was inculcated in the letter of the lord bishop, and this was the law which was expressed in the verdict of the jury; and, by virtue of the law, the ministers of the law of Queen Victoria, for having dared to support her authority, are now immured in a gaol.

This is the plain English of the whole transaction. The quarrel was between the adherents of the priests and the ministers of the law of the land. In a scuffle the former got the worst; and the meek and loyal priests of Six-mile-bridge, do honour to their martyrs, and they claim their victims for revenge. We are not sorry that they have thus specially honoured the memory of the rioters—that they have thus openly and undisguisedly made common cause with the election outrages.

WATERFORD.

During the last week, we are informed, a meeting of "the clergy" and liberal electors of the county of Waterford was held at the residence of the Roman Catholic Bishop of Waterford. The parish priest of Dungarvan was there, the parish priest of Lismore was there, some two dozen coadjutors, red-hot from Maynooth—none of them voters, but all of them ready for battle. The gentry of the county were well represented in the persons of the secretaries, Frank Kennedy, of Ballinamultina, in the far west; Edmond Power, of Tramore, in the east. Both these gentlemen hold her Majesty's commission of the peace; one of them enjoys a pension. The speech of the day was made by the Chamberlain of our Corporation, whose employments are as varied as his emoluments, and who has sworn the oath of allegiance as coroner of the county and receiver of the Admiralty droits of this district. From this august body has proceeded a proclamation convening a county meeting at Dungarvan. The report of that meeting is published by a contemporary—the avowed organ of the ultramontane party—and on the next day—the next day mind you—issues from the same office a hand-bill, part of it black as the minds who issued it, part of it bloody as the feelings which actuated so fiendish an atrocity. Here is the proclamation we allude to. The placard appears just as we give it; but the Queen's proclamation printed in the posters all through the county in letters of a deep and bloody hue:—

CATHOLIC PERSECUTION AGAIN.

Electors of the county Waterford,
read the following
of the

BLOODY PROCLAMATION.

Hutchinson-Derby Government.

[Here follows the Queen's Proclamation.]

From the Clonmel Chronicle.

All honour to the tenant-farmers of Waterford, who have so nobly distinguished themselves in setting at nought the unchristian attempts of the priesthood to create dissension between them and their Landlords. We hope that the gentry of Waterford will continue to stand by such a spirited tenantry, and protect them, at all hazards, from the consequences which may arise from altar denunciation—for persecution has not ceased with closing of the booths—but the ministers of peace persevere in fighting still the battle of the cross. In one chapel, not far from Clonmel, we understand that the priest on Sunday last read out the names of those who voted for Mr.

Hutchinson, and having done so, left the victims to be dealt with as mob law demands.

ELECTION INTIMIDATION.

We received the following letter from a respected friend of ours, who was an eye-witness to every occurrence which he reports to us, and upon whose veracity the utmost reliance may be placed. Intimidation was the order of the day in the county Waterford, as well as that of Tipperary. Upwards of 2,000 voters who had promised to vote for Captain Otway, were deterred from coming to the poll, in consequence of the threats of their good, and pious, and patriotic pastors—*cui bono*. Of what use, therefore, is the elective franchise to these men who dared not exercise it, lest they might be murdered in this world, and damned in the next—give us the ballot:—

“Waterford, July 26.

“MY DEAR SIR—You are aware of the return this day of Messrs. Esmonde and Power for the county Waterford—the former by a majority of only 31 over the Hon. Hely Hutchinson. Well may the latter gentleman look upon the result as a glorious triumph in this county, supported as he was by many respectable Roman Catholic families, in opposition to the priestly intolerance, and the unwarrantable manner in which the clergymen of that church, by threatening to withhold the last rites of their religion from the voters and their families, kept back the misguided dupes. With what intimidation were those used who came to vote with their landlords, in aid of the agricultural interests; aye, even some were carried off and locked up in a chapel, a priest guarding the door until after the close of the poll.”

Correspondent of Waterford Mail.

The names of all those electors in Killeah parish, fifty-two in number, who voted for Hutchinson (many of whom split for Power), were placarded through Waterford, and inserted as an advertisement in the *News*. The priests denounced them from the altar at both Masses on Sunday week; their children, who were learning the catechism preparatory to confirmation, were turned out of the chapel by the priest, and told that they would not be confirmed by the bishop. The names of those who voted for Christmas or Baron, at the late election for our city, have been also placarded, and denounced as “black sheep.” The wife of a respectable inn-keeper in the west of this county was taken to her private room and placed on her knees by Father——, who made her promise not to lie in the same bed with her husband for a day and a twelve month if he

voted for Hutchinson. A voter who had resisted all the threats of the above reverend gentleman, as well as the cries and entreaties of his wife and children, upon whom his reverence had been working, yielded at length, on being told by him that, "if he voted for Hutchinson he not only betrayed his religion, but trampled on the Holy Mother of God!" whose image he produced to him.

The following are extracts from a private letter from Ardmore, dated Friday last; we omit the names of the individuals to whom allusion is made:—

* * * We had a scene of the most fearful excitement here last evening. About 4 o'clock the steamer which was to carry off the voters on Mr. Hutchinson's side, rounded the head; an express was immediately sent off for the priest. We were seated by the cliffs overlooking the Boat Cove, in order to view the scene. A party of soldiers, and two officers bivouaced on the lovely strand; a large body of police looking steady, quiet, and stately, marching in along the Currah road, where we saw a party of voters coming along down Coffee-st., and stretching quietly along the port wall; again they are seen on the rock *

* * they are on the point of embarkation; two parties are already on board, when a horseman is seen dashing along the road; in two seconds he is near—it is the priest, his face perfectly blue and scarlet—awful to behold, and, like his horse, actually foaming at the mouth. In an instant he is followed by a mob of about one hundred, who rush on and emulate the speed of the padre's charger, all shouting and yelling. He is upon us, and we, on the verge of the cliff feel instant death before us; a rushing mob sweeping by headed by the furious priest on horseback, shaking his whip at the vessel underneath, and the names of Mr.—and Mr.—uttered in every form of imprecation. He is gone to curse the steam-vessel, and invoke a tempest to keep her six weeks at sea! We endeavoured to fly for home, and climb the hill to Mr.—'s house where I met several ladies all terrified. One glance more, ere I rush on, Mr.—heads another party of tenantry; they are coming to embark; the priest rushes back to meet him, followed by his mob, the priest calling Mr.—by names impossible for christian tongue to utter, invoking imprecations on the—as he called him, and his black spawn, as he called—. The mob now became most excited—the soldiers roused from their quiet bivouac, are seen rushing on at a double quick pace; the police, too, press forward to the support of—and his party of electors; the priest calling him ruffian, scoundrel, liar, &c.—one farmer moved on before the other voters, and was heard to say that no priest should coerce him; and this party made good their embarkation. The priest and his mob now endeavoured to block up the passage leading to the landing place, the priest, the more effectively to do so, having placed his horse across the way,

while his rider in a most ferocious speech uttered the most violent invectives against — and — and those who accompanied them, together with threats of the most violent character. Nothing could exceed the forbearance, and above all, the quiet courage of the magistrates and gentlemen insulted to the teeth. The riots at Stockport and every subject which was likely to excite the feelings of Irish Roman Catholics was resorted to by the speaker, in order to excite them and force them to the affray, but thanks be to God, without effect, as the military and police force overawed them. When all were embarked, 100 plumpers, good men, and true, from the stronghold of the opposite party (Esmonde), the priest retired, to what he told the mob was a sick call, followed, of course, by them. Such is the Irish priest, the christian who should preach Christ by example as precept. Such is he who should embody the works of the Spirit, Love, Peace, and Temperance, and avoid enmity, strife, and uncharitableness. When shall our benighted people awake from the sleep of darkness, and cease to reflect the passions of an ignorant, turbulent, and unchristian priesthood? Alas! when, God only knows.

We are quiet to-day, although last night was, to us, one of watchfulness. The army and police have retired.

YOUGHAL.

From the Waterford Mail.

INTIMIDATION—At Youghal election a mob, excited to a pitch of ruffianly excitement, dragged the Roman Catholic electors who had promised Mr. Butt not to vote against him, to the poll; the priests, and especially a priest named Falvey, headed them. Mr. Butt's last voters were brought up under an escort of constabulary and dragoons.—One Roman Catholic gentleman—Vincent Russell—who made solemn and repeated pledges not to vote against Mr. Butt, was polled for Mr. Fortescue. A poor man was put forward to personate his dead father, but threw down the book, and refused to perjure himself, amid the execrations of the spectators.

In Cork, in Limerick, in New Ross, in Clare, in Westmeath, in Kilkenny, in Down, in Donegal, in Tyrone, and in nearly every warmly contested county and borough in Ireland, the priestly influence was deliberately, we might almost say in concert, brought to bear, in order to counteract the free exercise by the electors of their franchise.

The following priests, with numerous others, whose names we could not collect, nominated or seconded members at the late election—

In Longford, the Rev. Edward M'Gaver, P.P., seconded one of the candidates, and the Rev. Mr. Dease, P.P., daily delivered addresses from the hotel windows to the non-electors. In the borough of Carlow, the Rev. Dr. Walsh, of Carlow College, nominated Mr. Sadlier. In the borough of Galway, the Rev. P. Daly, P.P., nominated Mr. O'Flaherty. In the borough of Clonmel, the Very Rev. Dr. Burke, P.P., nominated Mr. Lawless, and the Ven. Archdeacon Laffan spoke in his favour. In the county of Cork, Mr. Scully was seconded by the Rev. Mr. Corkran, P.P. In King's County, Mr. Blond was seconded by the Rev. Dr. O'Rafferty, P.P., and Mr. O'Brien by the Rev. W. O'Malley, P.P. In Tipperary, the Very Rev. Dr. Burke, P.P., and the Rev. J. Morris, P.P., proposed Mr. Scully; and the Rev. Mr. Laffan, P.P., seconded Mr. Sadlier. In Waterford, the Rev. Mr. Flynn, P.P., seconded Mr. Power. In Leitrim, the Very Rev. Dean Dawson, P.P., proposed Dr. Brady; and the Rev. P. Curran, P.P., proposed Mr. M'Mahon. In Carlow county the Rev. Mr. Lawler, P.P., proposed Mr. Keogh. In Meath, four priests, the Rev. Mr. Kelly, P.P., the Rev. Mr. Power, P.P., the Rev. R. Ennis, P.P., and the Rev. Thomas Langan, united in recommending Messrs. Corbally and Lucas. In Queen's County, the Rev. Mr. Fitzpatrick, P.P., proposed Mr. Dunne. In Mayo, Dr. M'Hale himself proposed Mr. Moore, and the Very Rev. Dean Burke and the Rev. Mr. Hardiman recommended Mr. Higgins. In Limerick, the Rev. Mr. Hickey, P.P., proposed Mr. Monsell, and Archdeacon Fitzgerald, P.P., spoke in his favour. In Westmeath, the Rev. Mr. Coghlan, P.P., proposed Mr. Urquhart, and the Rev. Mr. Dowling, P.P., spoke. In Wexford, the Rev. J. Redmond, P.P., proposed Mr. Morgan, and the Rev. P. Devereux, Mr. M'Mahon. In Galway, we find Dr. M'Hale again, proposing Mr. Bellew, and the Rev. J. Macklin, P.P., recommending Sir Thomas Burke. In Clare, we find the Rev. Mr. Lynch, P.P., the Rev. Mr. Quaid, P.P., the Rev. J. M'Mahon, P.P., and the Rev. Mr. Bourke, uniting in the recommendation of Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Fitzgerald. In Monaghan, we have the Rev. P. Brennan, P.P., proposing Dr. Gray. In Kilkenny, we find the Rev. Mr. Ayrward, P.P., recommending Sergeant Shee. And in Limerick City, the Rev. J. Brahan, P.P., proposing Mr. O'Brien.

The three great causes which have rendered the Irish priesthood powerful for evil during the recent elections, traceable to Lord John Russell.

From the Morning Herald.

It may be considered almost a fortunate occurrence that the conduct of the emissaries of the Romish church has of late years been of that unmistakable nature that not even the dull-est comprehension or most bigotted partisanship can any longer overlook or deny the existence of a wide-spread conspiracy against the liberties of Europe in general, and of this country in particular.

The fearful doings of the Irish Romanist priesthood during the late elections, and their awful results, have been by this time brought home to the convictions of every thinking man in

England. Such men have now realised to themselves that crime and outrage, perjury and persecution, violence and bloodshed, have been the instruments by which a priesthood, which disgraces the name of Christian, has carried out the behests, of a foreign potentate, and returned to the British House of Commons 54 agents pledged to the destruction of every institution dear to the hearts and necessary to the liberties of Englishmen.

There have been three things which have rendered the Irish priesthood powerful for evil in the last elections, and the existence of these three circumstances, each and all, may with justice be attributed to the direct agency of Lord John Russell, acting with a full knowledge of the fearful effects to be produced, but with a hope that they would tell in favour of the Whig party. The result of the elections has proved that he succeeded in producing the evils, but failed totally in turning them to his own advantage.

The first circumstance was, that by liberal legislation a vote had been forced upon the more ignorant and superstitious of the lower Irish, contrary to their own wish. Englishmen will learn with amazement that the Irish voter (who cannot use the franchise except at the bidding of another) finds himself registered without any overt act of his own—no claim made, no application lodged; so that the priest can come to him and say, “The Legislature has forced upon you a power for which you have not asked, and I will now compel you, under the most fearful penalties, to use it contrary to your own wishes and interests, to forward my views for the destruction of England’s power.”

The second evil was, that Lord John had by this recent legislation deprived the sheriff and his assessors of the power of refusing votes which were obviously illegal. The controul of the church was here left full scope, and in hundreds, not to say thousands of instances, perjury was forced upon ignorant men by their Christian instructors. Emigration, absence, death itself, was no obstacle, and votes were tendered to, and compulsorily received by polling clerks, who well knew that the individual whose vote they were recording for the Liberal candidate was dead, hanged, or transported; but the oath was taken, the priest gave absolution, and Liberalism triumphed.

The third evil, also traceable to Lord John, was the fact, that many of the stipendiary magistrates are nominees of the priests, and their activity, absence, or connivance, paralysed the well-meant exertions of the military and police. What is to be thought of a country where towns, the second or third in Ireland, were given up to sack, intimidation, and mob rule for hours, while two thousand of the best troops in Europe, and a large police force were rendered powerless by the apathy or imbecility of the persons specially appointed to preserve the

peace? We do not say that all neglected their duty, but when we know that these functionaries have been for years systematically appointed on the recommendation of the enemies of order and good government, we can feel no surprise at the otherwise astounding fact, that in Ireland ten thousand police and twenty thousand soldiers were employed to secure freedom of election, and utterly failed.

These three evils at least must be set to right before we can hope for anything but a renewal of the disgusting scenes of July, 1852, whenever the mockery of an election is enacted in Ireland.

Ireland is, indeed, an unfortunate country, not only in her own inherent evils, but in the fact that factions in this country find it their interest to aggravate those evils, and prevent the development of any germ of good, and so act in accordance with those interests, totally regardless of the monstrous cruelty and dishonesty of their proceedings.

THE RITES OF THE CHURCH REFUSED TO ELECTORS.

(From the Times.)

The other day we had to speak of Roman Catholic priests who in broad daylight stood up before assemblies of the ignorant peasantry, and authoritatively declared to them that to vote for any candidate but the one on whom the choice of the priest had fallen was to incur eternal damnation. The same wretched blasphemers announced that they would refuse to perform any of the rites of their Church in favour of those voters, or their families, who should give their suffrages to any but the priests' nominees. Their children should not be baptized—the rites of marriage should not be solemnised for them; when they were lying on their deathbeds they should be denied the last consolations of religion—they should be cast out from the sanctuary, and stand accursed among their fellow-countrymen, if they refused to follow implicitly the orders issued to them from the head-quarters of the Roman Catholic party. This is no question of *Derby v. MacHale*, or *MacHale v. Derby*, with us. It is an expression of honest indignation at one of the foulest scenes which has ever been known in the constitutional annals of this country. It would be the same thing to us whether the candidates who have incurred the hatred of the Roman Irish priesthood had been men whose policy was in all respects most averse to our own. We can see nothing but a system of intimidation which has rendered the theory of an elective Parliament a mere delusion throughout Ireland. It is out of no affection for Lord Derby that we call attention to the language and denunciations of his unscrupulous opponents. Dr. MacHale told the electors

of Galway the other day that only under the following conditions could they make up their minds to vote for any candidate who might support Lord Derby's administration :—

[For Extract from Dr. MacHale's Speech, see p. 194.]

It is but a few days since there appeared in the columns of the *Times* a letter from Mr. Lacy himself, charging Dr. MacHale with deliberate falsehood for so much of the above tissue of blasphemy as had reference to his own name. Dr. MacHale knew right well that the proposition of which he spoke was simply one of precaution with reference to a single point—namely, that young women and girls should not be trepanned into a Roman Catholic convent, and detained there by force and fraud. Can he suppose that the cases of the Blackrock Nunnery and of Miss Talbot have left so little trace upon the recollection of us all, that we can forget what the conduct of the Roman priesthood in England has been with regard to these helpless persons?

We confess that, unless means be discovered to stay this monstrous evil, the attempt to obtain a representation of Ireland through the elective machinery yet known to us, is a perfect farce. Priest-ridden and ignorant as the electors are in too many districts of the country, they would not have given their suffrages in favour of the candidates of the priest, had they been permitted to exercise anything like free choice. The proof of this assertion is to be gathered from the very blasphemies which we have very reluctantly brought under public notice. The measure of the violence employed by the priests, is the measure of the voter's reluctance. You don't bind a willing elector down in a cart—you don't shut him up under safe watch in a dark room—you don't threaten to refuse him the rites of the Church—you don't invoke eternal damnation on his head. Wherever scenes such as these have occurred there is no true election. The conscience of the voter has been coerced, and by agencies from which any but the most wicked and unprincipled men would recoil with horror. It is no light matter to mix up the Almighty in the proceedings of an Irish election.

A P P E N D I X.

A FAIR SPECIMEN OF THE PRIESTS OF IRELAND.

Call for a Romish Crusade against England.—Extract of a Letter addressed to the Earl of Derby, by priest Cahill.

Heaven be for ever praised, the scene is at length beginning to change ; the sun of Great Britain is fast descending from its culminating point ; your day of unrivalled sway is certainly drawing to a close ; your national character and prestige are beyond all doubt gone ; your nation is now universally branded as deceitful and degraded : you have decidedly forfeited the confidence of Europe, and you are hated, despised, and abhorred by the whole world. Your two successive governments have exposed England to the contempt of mankind ; you have made her a jester at St. Petersburg, a revolutionist and a base cringer at Vienna, a timeserver at Paris, an infidel at Rome, a traitor at Naples, a burglar at Madrid, a perjurer at Lisbon, a persecutor at Berne, a tyrant at Athens, a coward at Washington, a hypocrite at home, and the devil in Ireland ! Oh ! shame on you, Lord John Russell ! and oh ! fie, fie on you, Lord Derby ! to employ the time of two successive parliaments in degrading your country, and to engage the official services of bishops, judges, barristers, surgeons, lords, and ladies, in endeavouring to dethrone the pope, searching out for the private scandals of ecclesiastics, mending and dressing up for inspection at Exeter Hall old tattered calumnies on our creed, peeping into the bedrooms of convents, listening behind our confessionals, dogging our school girls to the church, watching our orphans at their meals, jibing priests at their prayers, mobbing nuns in the public streets, counting the charities they receive for their humble support, and stealing through lanes and alleys looking for a case of slander against the faith of 240,000,000 of the human population, and against the creed of the most ancient families in England, and the most devoted subjects of the Queen.

The correspondents of the English journals are hunted like felons from every city in Europe ; their letters examined, and themselves ordered to quit in 48 hours, when their occupation of slander and infidelity is known. Yes, our answers to your base calumnies are now published in our favour by the universal cry of ‘shame’ from all foreign nations—hear it, my lord. While you are slandering us in the Lords, and while Russell was spewing his Woburn apostacy on bishops in the Commons, the French army, the invincible sons of the glorious

Frank, were kneeling before the mitred Archbishop of Paris ; and as he raised the adorable Host beneath the blue unfathomable vault, the loud clang of the French steel at the 'elevation,' as the army drew their swords and presented arms to the God of battles, amid the thunders of 100 pieces of ordnance, was the significant and appropriate answer which glorious Catholic France sent on the morning breeze to bigotted England, in reply to your parliamentary vituperation. . . .

Your name is detested in all the neighbouring countries, and your accomplices have been expelled with a summary command, and, indeed, with an insult which you have not or dare not resent. Beyond all doubt you and your rebel and infidel accomplices have been removed from Austria, Hungary, Prussia (Protestant)—from Rome, Naples, and Lombardy. Your Bible Societies, which are reported as your emissaries of insurrection, have been watched as public enemies ; and it is an historical fact, admitting of no doubt whatever, that neither in public nor in private will those countries tolerate English influence to be exercised in their religious, social, or political concerns. The continental education, which you had nearly corrupted by your money and your emissaries, has now undergone a total change. The Catholic clergy are now placed in all these countries as the sole directors and guardians of the education and the literary and religious training of the rising generation ; and Prince Louis Napoleon, now so much abused by your journals, has introduced changes in all the educational schools of France, and will soon restore the ancient discipline of the Catholic Church, which placed education in the hands of the ministers of religion.

THE LATE MR. THOMAS MOORE'S OPINION OF POPERY.

From a letter to Lady Donegal, as given in his Life by Lord John Russell :—

“ Monday, April 16, 1815,

“ Your letters deserved a much speedier answer, both to thank you for the very kind anxiety you have expressed about me, and to set your heart at rest upon the subject of them. If there is anything in the world that I have been detesting and despising more than another for this long time past, it has been those very Dublin politicians whom you so fear I should associate with. I do not think a good cause was ever ruined by a more bigotted, brawling, and disgusting set of demagogues ; and, though it be the religion of my fathers, I must say that much of this vile, vulgar spirit is to be traced to that wretched faith which is again polluting Europe with Jesuitism and Inquisitions, and which of all the humbugs that have stultified mankind is the most narrow-minded and mischievous ; so much for the danger of my joining Messrs. O'Connell, O'Donnell, &c.”

Such were the Irish Papists, such was the Popery of 1815, as described by the “ Roman Catholic Gentleman Traveller in Search of a Religion.”

Dying declaration of the celebrated William Lord John Russell—the Christian patriot and martyr, who made libation of his blood in the cause of religious liberty—

“I have lived and now die of the reformed religion, a true and sincere Protestant, and in the communion of the church of England; though I could never comply with or rise up to the heights of some people, I wish with all my soul all our unhappy differences were removed, and that all sincere Protestants would so far consider the danger of Popery as to lay aside our heats, and agree against the common enemy; and that the churchmen would be less severe and the dissenters less scrupulous; for I think bitterness and persecution are at all times bad, but much more now. * * * I did believe, and do still, that Popery is breaking in on this nation, and that those who advance it will stop at nothing to carry on their design—I am heartily sorry that so many Protestants give their helping hand to it. But I hope God will preserve the Protestant religion, and this nation, though I am afraid it will fall under very great trials, and very sharp suffering.”

Would to heavens, that the present Lord John Russell were guided by those noble sentiments, to act as a genuine Protestant should do.

ALL RIBBONMEN ARE ROMAN CATHOLICS.

Extracts from the Evidence of Captain George Fitzpatrick.

The Attorney General (Mr. Napier) in the Chair.

You stated, did you not, that Ribbonism had its origin in sectarian feeling? That is my impression.

Political or religious? Religious; indeed both.

Is Ribbonism confined, in your opinion, to the members of one creed? Altogether.

Of what creed? The Roman Catholic; none others are admitted, in my opinion.

Have you any evidence of that, or is it a matter of opinion merely? I believe that to be the case. From everything I know of the matter I believe it; and I believe it is well known that no other sect ever belonged to that society.

The interest in the tenure of land is common both to Roman Catholics and Protestants, is it not? It is.

If the interest be common how is a secret society with reference to the tenure of land confined to one sect? They are sympathised with by parties whose interest it is to sympathise with them, and support them, but they are not admitted into the society as a body unless they are Roman Catholics.

When you connected Ribbonism with agrarian outrages you stated that those who were Ribbonmen must be Roman Catholics? Yes.

You also stated that those who committed crimes against the landlords and agents were Ribbonmen? Yes.

Entirely so? Yes; all those who committed the recent murders.

Were they all Roman Catholics who were accused of these murders in the north? Yes.

You are not aware of any Protestants having been accused of committing any of these murders? No.

THE PROVINCIAL SYNOD AT ST. MARY'S, OSCOTT.

From the Times.

There is now lying before us a printed paper bearing the title of a synodical letter of the "Fathers assembled in Provincial Council at St. Mary's, Oscott," and the style which the said Fathers are pleased to assume is:—"We, the Archbishops and Bishops of the province of Westminster, in provincial synod assembled, to our beloved brethren and children in Christ, the clergy secular and regular, and the faithful under our jurisdiction." Since the Bull of 1850, and the swaggering pastoral which accompanied it, we have not seen anything more deliberately and studiously impertinent. With what an easy assumption do these men talk of the province of Westminster as of a geographical division of our Island, legal, patent, and notorious; with what perfect nonchalance do they put aside the law of the country in which they live by which this ecclesiastical provision is proscribed! They have discovered the art of conveying more insolence and defiance by mere omissions than others can do by the most laboured invectives. The utter absence of any reference to the existing religion and hierarchy of the country excites the same feeling of indignation as two years ago, and points out in the most expressive terms the unbending and undeviating arrogance which thus avails itself of our tolerance to insult us.

We observe also that in this document the bishops claim "jurisdiction," a term of distinct legal import, implying the possession of lawful powers, and therefore, in a case where no such powers exist, asserting a right in the Pope to intermeddle at his pleasure with the laws and institutions of this country, and to interpolate among them regulations which have, for so the word imports, a compulsory and obligatory force. These bishops, in provincial synod assembled, addressed only "the faithful," under their jurisdiction, clearly implying that they have jurisdiction over the faithful, that is, over her Majesty's Protestant subjects, and that if that jurisdiction be not enforced, it is from a defect of power, and not of right. When we consider that these men remain in this country and exercise their spiritual func-

tions merely because the nation is too deeply devoted to the principles of toleration to suffer them to be violated, even in the most odious cases, we may well wonder that they should adopt a tone of such exuberant and overbearing intolerance, as if they wished to see if it were possible, by any amount of provocation and insult, to induce us to retrace our steps, and employ those weapons of persecution against them on which their church in all ages has relied. They may possibly succeed in this wicked and hollow policy, but succeed far more completely than they desire. Looking at the pledges given by the members of the new parliament, and the feeling evinced throughout the country, it is not very likely the next time the Roman Catholic religion forms the subject of legislation it will be dealt with as leniently as before, and it is very possible that public opinion, if thus wilfully and repeatedly irritated, may demand the reinforcement of such laws as still remain on the statute book to curb the aggressions and check the insolence of the Papacy and its adherents.

Appointment of Paul Cullen, an alien, to the Roman Catholic Primacy.

From a London Journal.

The mode in which Irish Roman Catholic bishops have been appointed, it seems, is by a species of election by the priests of the vacant diocese and the bishops of the province. These assembled, and selected three names, which were forwarded to Rome. The Pope appointed the bishop. He was not bound, indeed, to select him from the three recommended, but it is said that there never had been an instance in which the practice of electing one of these had been departed from before the recent appointment of a Primate; while so generally was the recommendation acted on that almost invariably the first named of the three was the individual appointed.

The writer in the *Dublin University Magazine*, evidently one thoroughly acquainted with the subject of which he treats, cites various passages from the evidence of Roman Catholic prelates before the parliamentary committee of 1852, to prove that this mode of nomination was then regarded as an established usage, and, further, was strongly relied upon by these Roman Catholic witnesses, as offering a perfect pledge of fidelity, on the part of the elected bishops, to the country and the Government; excluding virtually all foreign influence in the nomination, and ensuring, further, the selection of resident British subjects, bound, as well as the electors, to the Sovereign by the oath of allegiance. It appears, however, that when the Roman Catholic Primacy became vacant by the death of Archbishop Croly—

the Pope, in nominating his successor, adopted the utterly unprecedented step of entirely disregarding the recommendation of the Irish priests, and bishops, and nominated a stranger who had not been named or thought of in a single suffrage at the domestic election, passing by three men of the very highest repute and most blameless character in the Irish Roman Catholic church, whose names were recommended by the priests and bishops. The Papal Court nominated to the vacant Primacy Dr. Cullen, an Irishman by birth, but who had for thirty years been domiciled as a priest in "the Eternal city," and who, therefore, in feeling, in habit, and association, may fairly be considered as a foreigner—whom we may certainly believe to be imbued with the politics and sentiments of the Papal Court.

Here, then, argues the writer of the *University Magazine*, is lost the security upon which such Romish prelates as Dr. Doyle and Archbishop Murray declared the State might depend. The new Primate has been appointed, not by Irishmen, but by Italians. He owes his nomination to his high office, in no degree, however small, to the choice or recommendation of any one even owing the duty of allegiance to the Queen. On the contrary, his appointment is a direct slight upon the recommendation of British subjects. Neither is he a resident of the British dominions. The Irish born priest, who has for thirty years been a resident at the Vatican, is a denizen, not of Ireland, but of Rome. And when this prelate comes to Ireland, owing his elevation entirely to Papal influence, and comes, moreover, with a special pontifical delegation, we find his very first act to be to convene, in a style, so far as his means extended, of pompous magnificence, a Synod that he calls national. Over his novel convocation he presides, by the delegated authority of the Pope, and it is now no secret that, for the express purpose of over-ruling the opinions of the more moderate Irish bishops, he calls upon the Synod to register with uninquiring reverence the decrees of the papal conclave, regulating the mode in which Irishmen are to be educated, and denouncing the institutions which the British parliament and British Sovereign have provided for that purpose.

Without saying how far we adopt the inferences that the *Dublin University Magazine* draws from these facts, it cannot be denied that the unusual mode of this appointment, following the still more unusual proceedings by which his primacy has been inaugurated, does at least lend countenance to the suspicion that some new and daring policy is contemplated at Rome, to carry out which it was necessary to break through established usages and select the most fitting instrument, in disregard of recommendations that have been usually deferred to.

So far, the facts stated by the writer in the magazine are facts of public notoriety, and upon the existence of which, therefore,

no controversy can arise. Another statement, however, is added, for which no authority is given, and which, we confess, appears to require some. It is stated in the very respectable and cautious periodical upon which we are commenting, that the new Primate has declined to take the oath of allegiance to the Queen, and the necessity of taking that oath as a qualification is assigned as a reason for his refusing an office of charity and trust. If this statement be accurate, and it has now been a fortnight before the public uncontradicted, it does appear to us to be a matter deserving the most serious attention. Perhaps, if it be true, the most charitable construction of Dr. Cullen's conduct would be that, by long residence in Rome, he regarded himself as a naturalised Roman citizen. The plea would be as bad in reason as it would be in law. We confess that, with the power and status now conferred upon the Irish Roman Catholic church, we cannot feel it a matter of indifference that the head of that church—a man too who seems resolved to signalise his primacy by calling out its energies into unusual activity—should, in temporal as well as spiritual things, consider himself a Roman not a British citizen—a subject of Pío Nono, and not of the Queen.

Let us hope that, as to this matter of the oath of allegiance, there is some mistake. Still, whatever may be the real state of facts with regard to this, there is in the unquestioned facts that are made the subject of comment in the *University Magazine*, in the strange spectacle of the recently assembled Synod, viewed in connection with the appointment of its convener—there is, we say, in these things matter sufficient to occupy the grave attention of all who know the tremendous influence which the policy of the Romish Church can exercise upon the peace and prosperity of Ireland, and through Ireland, upon the well-being of the British Empire.

THE BIBLE IN MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.

To the Editor of the "Morning Herald."

Sir,—In the very curious and extraordinary correspondence which has appeared in your paper, in reference to Mr. McGregor's visit to Maynooth College, and Dr. Russell's epistle from the same establishment, repudiating the charges brought by the former gentleman against that College, I beg now, as an *alumni*, to make one remark explanatory of my experience in the said School of Divinity.

Dr. Russell states, of course on his honour, that "each Student had his own copy of the Bible." Now I assert, with all the solemnity of an oath, that while I lived in that College, during a period of six years, and was educated for a priest of

the Church of Rome, I had no Bible in my possession from the College; nor am I aware that any of my class-fellows then possessed a copy of that sacred book; nor was it a class-book in our divinity course, even in a dead language!

After the usual career in College, I was ordained by the Most Rev. Dr. Murray, from whom I still retain my Letters of Orders.

When by the blessing of God, I came to read the Bible, I renounced for ever the Popery of Romanism, and embraced the pure religion of Jesus Christ as it is taught in the United Church of England and Ireland, under the auspices of the Priests' Protection Society.

Messrs. M'Gregor and Russell may settle the matter in dispute as best they can; but this one thing I have done—I have stated the truth, and have the honour to be,

Your most obedient Servant,

PATRICK O'BRIEN,
A Reformed Romanist Priest.

23, *Upper Sackville-street, Dublin,*
March 5th, 1852.

THE CLASS BOOKS OF MAYNOOTH.

From the Morning Advertiser.

We can find in the British Museum, Sion college, and most other of our public libraries, copies of all the books written by the Jesuits, which were condemned by the parliament of Paris in 1762, and publicly burned by the common hangman, on account of the felonious principles of action which they inculcate. Among them were the works of twenty-eight individual Jesuits, and one company of them, for teaching perjury, forgery, and bearing false witness; of six individual Jesuits for teaching collusion of judges; of thirty-two Jesuits for teaching theft and private or secret compensation by wives, children, and servants; of seventeen for defending and teaching open and secret murder; of five for defending and teaching the murder of parents; of three for teaching suicide; and above fifty individual Jesuits, and of the Jesuits of Flanders, for defending, teaching, and exhorting to the perpetration of high treason, and the open and secret murder of sovereign princes, or regicide. Many other works of Jesuits were burned at the same time, for defending and inculcating the infamous doctrines of probable opinions, philosophical sin, and invincible ignorance; and the practice of simony, blasphemy, sacrilege, magic, impiety and atheism, idolatry, astrology, lewdness, &c. We cannot state with precision the number of authors whose works were then burned, because many were published, as the productions of

seven or eight colleges of Jesuits, at Rheims, at Rome, Rouen, Caen, and in Flanders. Not only are these books, which were thus cendemned, together with their authors, to everlasting ignominy, still in high repute among the Jesuits, but a multitude of others have since been written, containing the same sentiments, principles, and exhortations; and, what is more, the Class Books in use at the College of Maynooth, which is supported with Protestant money, are selected from the latter—a circumstance which accounts for the depraved and ruffianly character of the Irish priests, and for the pre-eminence of Irish Celts in the worst crimes that disgrace human nature.

IRISH COLLEGE IN PARIS.

Maynooth was originally established to prevent the necessity of sending students to the colleges on the Continent; that Maynooth and the French colleges for priests are carried forward on the same system, will be seen by the following observations of the correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle*. What difference then, can there be, in the Priests of Rome being educated in France or Maynooth; or in one portion being educated in France and the remainder in Ireland?

“The Irish Roman Catholic bishops, Dr. M’Hale, Dr. Murphy of Cloyne, Dr. Derry of Clonfert, Dr. Denvir of Down and Connor, and Dr. Keane of Ross, left Paris, on their return to Ireland, on Thursday. On announcing their arrival I mentioned that the object of their coming to the French capital was the “visitation” of the Irish College, which the statutes of the establishment require shall take place at stated periods. It appears that previous to their departure they expressed themselves satisfied with the results of the management of the College. The Archbishop of Paris also visited the college on Sunday last, and, it is understood, expressed himself to the same effect. The day previous to the departure of the bishops a farewell address was delivered to the professors and students by Dr. Mac. Hale. The college is under the direction of the Rev. Dr. Miley.

A Montreal journal gives the following account of the cost of the Roman Catholic Church in Lower Canada:—

“The amount of tithes paid to the Catholic clergy by the Catholic population is at least £109,000 per year, which would be for the last 25 years alone the sum of £2,500,000. Upper Canada is free from such a tax. The loss of time caused to the Catholic population of Lower Canada by the number of obligatory holidays, novenas, retraites, &c., is at least 59 days per

year for each person, beside the Sabbaths. The Catholic population of Lower Canada, between the ages of 15 to 16 years, is at least 300,000 persons; each losing 50 days per year, which is 15,000,000 days lost, at a shilling per day, is an annual loss of £750,000. The loss for the last 25 years would be £18,750,000. The money paid by the Catholic population of Lr. Canada for low masses, high masses, funeral services, funeral anniversaries, marriage expenses, celebration of marriages, ceremonies, &c., becomes, also, a considerable sum, and cannot be less than £200,000 per year, which would be for the last 25 years £7,500,000."

OPPOSITION OF THE PRIESTS TO THE LAWS OF THE LAND.

The Roman Catholic clergy of the deanery of Loughrea have adopted the following series of resolutions, in reference to the proclamation against Romish processions:

"Resolved—That we have seen, with indignant surprise, a proclamation issued by the present government, in the name of our most gracious Queen, warning the Catholics of Great Britain and Ireland, that their religious processions will be henceforward punished as criminal infractions of the law, and that their bishops and priests, as well as the members of the religious orders, prosecuted if they presume to appear in public in their distinctive dress—that whilst we bear to her Majesty all the allegiance which in temporal matters is rightly due to the Sovereign by the subject, we recognize in the government no right to forbid to the Catholics of this empire, the peaceful observance of the usages of their church, or the use in public as well as in private of their distinctive robes by its bishops, priests, and religious orders.

"That a law, in terms directed against the free exercise of the Catholic religion, has no binding force, and, like all other penal enactments against the church, must be disregarded.

"That the law which would prohibit to Catholics the free exercise of their religious ceremonies has been felt to be so unjust that no administration (before the present) has outraged public opinion and sound policy by attempting to enforce it.

"That a government which, for the selfish purposes of existing in its own support the bigotted prejudices to be found in the Anglican Church establishment and its kindred sects, could thus unprovokedly attack the Catholics of the empire, would be met by the most determined resistance. That whilst it is the paramount duty of the Catholic electors of this county to return to parliament as their representative, Captain Bellew, who has manfully avowed himself the opponent alike of every administration, whether Whig or Tory, that would dare to persecute our religion or its institutions, it has now become parti-

cularly incumbent on them to refuse their vote to the candidate that comes forward as the general supporter of the government of the Earl of Derby.

"The abettors of the present administration have signalled themselves, individually and as a body, by their hatred of Catholicity and of its most cherished institutions. That attacks on the College of Maynooth, and the petitions presented among others by the so-called Bishop of Cashel, praying for an inspection of nunneries, afford evidence of the foul and malignant spirit with which they are animated.

"That we shall carefully instruct our respective parishioners in the responsibility that attaches to the elective franchise. That we shall explain to them the power, for good or evil, possessed by a member of parliament. We shall make known to them the blasphemous oath tendered to every Protestant representative, previous to his taking his seat in parliament, and thus enable them to judge of the vague and hollow professions by which it is attempted to impose on their simplicity."

POPERY IN IRELAND; AS IT WAS, AND AS IT IS.

Extract from an 'Argument for Ireland,' by J. O'Connell, Esq.

With respect to Ireland, an enumeration has taken place, and the relative numbers have been ascertained. The Episcopalian Protestants are found to be, in round numbers, eight hundred and fifty thousand, the Presbyterians, six hundred and fifty thousand, and the Catholics, six million five hundred thousand. Such were the relative proportions in 1831.

The Catholics of Ireland have had a considerable accession since the last census; that augmentation has probably been attributed with justice in some measure to the numbers of other Christians who daily join the church; whatever be the cause, it is likely that the Catholics are now not less than seven millions in Ireland.*

*Extract from a Lecture delivered in 1852, by John Edgar, D.D.
Presbyterian Clergyman of Belfast*

"It may be, or it may not be, that the spirit still lives in any Irish Romanists which animated them in 1641, when, according to Clarendon, they murdered forty thousand Protestants in cold blood, unwarned and unarmed, besides all who afterwards fell in the general massacre; we require not to be told that their principles are fresh and strong as ever: that any deed is justifiable which is done for the good of the church: the bullet shot by the assassin, nerved and envenomed by his priest's curse, is aimed at the landlord and heretic in the same person; and the spirit which, over all the country, protects the mur-

* Compare with pp. 115 and 233.

derer, and, in the jury-box, saves him from the gallows, or at the gallows triumphs over him as a martyr, is the very spirit which Popery has infused. That spirit has shown itself in a thousand ways in Ireland, in utter contempt and defiance of British law. What Protestant mission in Ireland cannot bear testimony to the persecution which converts from Romanism endure, and the base illegal means employed by Romish priests for preventing reformation? "In one district," says the Hon. Baptist Noel, "nine hundred Scripture readers are employed, and the greater number of them have been beaten or otherwise persecuted. Some have been savagely murdered, their only crime being their endeavour to guide others to the truth which they had found precious to themselves."

"An official document, addressed to a late Lord-lieutenant of Ireland, and afterwards published, states truly, that the whole of this dreadful and disgraceful state of things is attributable to the priests of the Roman Catholic church, from their altars. These priests glory in it, instead of denying it. The same number of a Ballina newspaper contains an account of the trial of the priest at Ballycastle, county Mayo, for cruelly beating a boy on his way to a scriptural school, and a letter from the priest of Ballina, defending his own conduct in having savagely beaten with a whip an aged female, for permitting her children to attend a scriptural school; and not only extolling the whip as an effectual means of keeping the peace, but quoting in its support the example of our Lord, in driving the buyers and sellers out of the Temple with a whip of small cords.*

"A friend of mine appealed to a Romish prelate on account of a priest having broken into her demesne, and beaten the children of her school. The bishop's reply was this: "As these children, for clothes and stirabout, are betraying the religion of their fathers, it is the duty of the priest to punish their parents in every legal way." Here, then, is the boundary which the Romish priest professes to set to his violence—"Every legal way;"—but is it a legal way to curse the inquiring layman by bell, book, and candlelight? A county Antrim jury said, "No!" when they returned a verdict of £70 damages against Priest Walsh, of the Glens, for cursing M'Glaughlin. Was it in a legal way that a Romish priest at Mayo, with a Romish mob at his back, rode down a Protestant missionary, though a Romish jury, in defiance of evidence and the charge of a Roman Catholic barrister, found him "Not guilty?" Is it lawful, either by the law of man or of God, for the Romish priest to excite his blinded people to deeds of deadliest violence against those whose only crime is activity for their good; and according to the doctrines which Popery teaches, and the powers

* To a very interesting work recently published, entitled "The Irish Reformation Movement," by Mr. J. G. Mac Walter, we refer the reader for authentic details on these matters.

which its priests assume, to do the priest's deadliest and worst, to shut up in hell for ever those who would give their children opportunity for learning the sanctifying truth of God?

"According to the Report of the Comissioners of Public Instruction, in 1834, Ireland contained 1,517,220 Protestants, and 6,427,712, Roman Catholics. Here were fearful odds against Protestantism; here a fearful host at the nod of Rome; here a region of darkness and despotism fearfully large. But famine, emigration, and other causes, have effected an incalculable change. As to numbers, the vast proportion of 2,000,000, dead or gone, were Romanists; and hence the proportion of Protestants and Romanists in Ireland has so thoroughly changed, that some authorities state, that Romanists do not exceed Protestants by more than 500,000, while by others the statement made is this:—Such is the decrease of Romanists by disease, emigration, and conversions, that, laying out of account 500,000 shut up in the workhouses, the Roman Catholic and Protestant population of Ireland are nearly equal!"

THE INTOLERANT SPIRIT OF POPERY.

(From the Times.)

The first proceedings of the recent session were directed against the encroachments of the Bishop of Rome upon the the national and ecclesiastical independence of this kingdom; the last words of the same parliament were devoted to the practicability of Protestant worship within the walls of Rome. The Pope treated England as a heathen country; he abolished, as far as in him lay, all the historical sees of the land, created a pompous hierarchy, sent a Cardinal to be enthroned at Westminster, and has now decreed the erection of a new cathedral, on a magnificent scale, in some conspicuous part of the metropolis. The same Pope forbids altogether the worship of God after the rites of the English Church within the walls of Rome, and condemns our countrymen to the performance of Divine service in a granary without the gates. At this moment there stands a "Cathedral of St. George," in the borough of Southwark, another "Cathedral of St. Patrick" has been designed, we believe for Westminster, and a third "Metropolitan Church of St. Peter" is now openly announced. To none of these proceedings has any objection been taken by the Protestant Government of England; but when a desire is expressed of erecting a simple church for the use of Englishmen sojourning at Rome, it is intimated that the requisite permission will certainly be withheld, and that no such design can be entertained.

The Romish churches of this kingdom are obviously built for purposes beyond those of independent congregational worship. There is already a superfluity of accommodation, in the sense usually given to the phrase. The edifices are designed

and multiplied with a special object of attraction, and with the evident view of extending the sphere of Romanism, to the proportionate disparagement of other establishments. We are not asserting that this kind of "aggression" is unrighteous in principle or intolerant in practice. Within reasonable bounds it is a proper duty of a religious community, nor can the spirit of proselytism be impugned when defined as a sincere anxiety for what is conceived to be the redemption of others. All we wish to show is, that the representatives of the Pope in this country are indulged in something more than the mere freedom of public worship. Though their whole system, from the fact of its addressing itself to the external senses, is essentially obtrusive, and though their parade and ceremonial are offensive to the eyes and repugnant to the traditions of Englishmen, they are not restricted in the matter of gauds or gewgaws. They declare the militant character of their church, they marshal and manœuvre their forces, prepare their magazines, and construct their strongholds exactly as they please, nor have they been checked in any thing except an experiment which, if it was not an insidious aggression, was a piece of empty arrogance. Yet, in the city of Rome, when we come to request an indulgence which we so freely grant, we are met with a direct refusal. * * * * *

"Freedom of worship, in the ordinary sense, means nothing more than the power of serving God according to conscience. "Freedom of worship" in the Romish sense, means the power of proscribing or assaulting every other form of belief, as circumstances may serve. It is the avowed duty of a papist not only to render certain service to his Maker, but to reject, condemn, and if possible destroy, all who render such service in any other manner. They themselves denounce toleration as the most heinous and deadly of errors; and they then come to us demanding to be freely tolerated in the establishment of this intolerant doctrine. They curse us for the very principle on the ground of which they ask to be indulged. So aggressive and exclusive is their spirit that, before they set up their own hierarchy, they abolished ours as a necessary preparation. They swept away, to the best of their power and belief, every monument of ecclesiastical organization in this country; they proclaimed a *tabula rasa* of all English and Welch sees, and then actually complained of intolerance, because we would not recognize the effigies which they set up in their place! Cannot Lord Aberdeen see how utterly inconsistent it is with even the maxims of self-preservation to extend unconditional license to a religious community whose professed function is to treat all others as heretics, and all heretics as sinners, to be bodily controlled?

As regards the particular question just discussed, we are not of course suggesting that a system of reciprocity should be ob-

served in our dealings with Rome. It is not our duty as Protestants and Englishmen to debar Roman Catholics from erecting churches, however offensively they may refuse such a privilege in return. We do think, however, that as circumstances stand, a direct appeal should be made by our Government to the Court of Rome for the permission at present so reasonably required. It would be advisable to get the practice of Rome in this respect put upon open record in a categorical answer to this demand. That the answer would be a negative is likely enough, but this negative might be serviceably published, and Christendom at large might judge of the principles of a bishop who claims the right of organizing hierarchies in all foreign States, and forbids the erection of a place of foreign worship in his own.

CONVICTION OF A CATHOLIC PRIEST FOR ASSAULTING A FEMALE.

Surrey Sessions, Dec. 11th, 1852.

The Rev. Daniel O'Donovan, a Catholic clergyman, was indicted for assaulting a married woman, named Mary Murphy.

From the evidence of the complainant it appeared that she was lodging with a woman named Harrington, in Parker's-rents, Bermondsey, where she had a bed in the kitchen. She was confined about three weeks ago. The defendant called at the house two nights after her confinement and gave her a shilling. A few days afterwards he called again; she was then sitting with her infant by the fire. He asked if the infant had been baptized, and she told him it had been baptized by the Rev. Mr. Armstrong, at the Protestant Church, which she attended. The priest then told her that she had sold herself to the devil, and he struck her several violent blows with his umbrella near the left ear. She called out for mercy, but he abused her, and told her landlady to turn her out of the house. His words were—"Turn the devil out." Her landlady obeyed the priest and took her bed from her, so that she was obliged to sleep on the floor with her baby. The complainant said she had been brought up a Catholic, but had turned Protestant when she married.

Mr. Woollett, who appeared for the defendant, asserted that the complainant had no principles of religion whatever, and that she sometimes stated she was a Protestant and sometimes a Catholic, just as she found it suit her purpose.

Mrs. Harrington, the complainant's landlady, and two females who were present when the priest called upon the complainant, were called for the defence. They all spoke against the complainant, but confirmed her evidence as to the charge of assault.

The jury at once returned a verdict of guilty.

Mr. Robinson, for the prosecution, said that if it had not

been for the severe coercion practised by the Catholic priests in Bermondsey, with regard to the poor Irish who left the church to which the defendant belonged, those proceedings would not have been taken, but he was instructed to say that the complainant had no vindictive feelings, and he hoped that no severe sentence would be passed upon him.

The Chairman expressed much pain in having to pass sentence upon an individual holding the sacred calling of a clergyman, the more so on this occasion, as it was clear that the most aggravated assault had been committed by the defendant on a poor woman weak from illness of no slight kind. If it had not been for the appeal made by the complainant, the court would have sentenced him to imprisonment and hard labour, but in consideration of what had been stated he would be fined 5*l*.

The fine was immediately paid.

It was found necessary to station a strong body of police in the neighbourhood of the court to protect the jury from the indignant mob of Irishmen, who yelled at them on leaving the court.

BRUTAL CONDUCT OF A POPISH MOB.

To the Editor of the Standard.

Sir—Since the conviction of priest Donovan, for a gross and unmanly assault upon Mary Murphy, one of the poor of my flock, her husband, a young man of 19, has been attacked by an infuriated mob of Papists, thrown down, and leaped upon. He has escaped, thank God, with his life, but he is sadly bruised and hurt. Another young man (a convert) was treated in the same way on Saturday evening. Several of these most Christian people have been heard to declare that if the priest had been imprisoned I should have been murdered; it was all arranged. I cannot conscientiously say that this threat gives me much alarm, as I estimate at its full value the courage of men who sympathise with the woman-beater; but this after threat almost makes me repent that I did not leave the magistrate to mete out to the priest the full measure of his deserts; but as my object is more to produce a moral effect upon the poor misguided Romanists, than to vindicate my character for animal courage, I am as well pleased I showed mercy, and I hope and pray it may convince the poor man of the error of his ways.

I am, sir,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN E. ARMSTRONG, L.L.D.,

Incumbent of St. Paul's, Bermondsey.

St. Paul's Bermondsey, Dec. 14, 1852.

SPECIMEN OF PRIESTLY INTOLERANCE.

From the Cork Constitution, Aug. 5.

COACHFORD PETTY SESSIONS.

J. Buckley v Rev. Wm. William M'Carthy.

The Prosecutor, being examined by Mr. Thos. Ware Corker, Solicitor, stated as follows : Witness is a young man in the employment of the Rector of Donoughmore, the Rev. Mr. Cotter, as Colporteur or Distributor of Bibles and Testaments ; was proceeding alone on Friday last on his peaceful mission, when he met Mr. Wm. M'Carthy, a Roman Catholic priest, who, after passing him, rode back and enquired what he had in the bundle ? Witness said "Bibles and Testaments, sir." The priest then induced deponent to produce all his books, and as soon as he got them together, he flung them in witness's face, dashing them about the road, and saying, "I left the house this morning to horsewhip you;" the priest then called a man to hold his horse, and jumping off, he ran at witness and struck him several blows across the face and neck, and when the lash of the whip came off he struck witness with the leaden end about the head, which but for the hardness of his hat might have killed him, and the man who held the horse, instead of coming to witness's relief, flourished his stick in a threatening manner. The priest then laid hold of witness by the breast and made two attempts to trip him by putting his leg behind witness ; he then let him go, and drew back to strike him another blow, when witness ran off without hat or books, calling out "murder," being in great fear of his life ; the hat was afterwards recovered, but Buckley was informed that the priest had caused the books to be burned on the road.

The Bench then consulted and agreed on taking informations against Mr. M'Carthy, and ordered that he should give bail to stand his trial at the next Quarter Sessions in Cork.

 PERSECUTION OF SCRIPTURE READERS.
From the Mayo Constitution, Aug. 10.

If priests and the fanatical savages that execute their wicked designs are determined to trample on law and order and liberty, and even common humanity, we will take special care that the public will hear of it at all events. This being so, we take the liberty of introducing Father Mullarky and his worthy colleague "*Arcades ambo*," to the notice of our readers. And in making allusion to two such important personages, the first thing that presents itself to us is that the autocrat Nicholas, does not claim such a stretch of power in "all the Russias" as Father Dan Mullarky does in Keltimogh. His serene Highness Father

Dan, will not suffer certain individuals to reside in Keltimogh without his permission! Now this is an act of tyranny that the Queen of England dare not attempt. And shall this priest be suffered to do it?

The facts to which we refer are the following:—Some time ago three young men went to reside at Keltimogh, as scripture-readers, and took up their abode with a Protestant who lives in the village. They surely had a perfect right to go there, and to be received by any one who wished to do so. They were inoffensive and peaceful. They brought no weapons but their Bibles. They conversed on religious matters with many, but with none who were unwilling to converse with them. They went into several houses, but into none where they were refused admittance. But the progress of peaceful men through the country, diligently reading, and speaking on the scriptures, was a formidable invasion of the dominions of the sacerdotal autocrat. He immediately publishes his *ukase*, and it is nothing less than this, that he (Father Dan Mullarky) even he will not suffer one of the Queen's subjects to live in a particular part of the Queen's dominions!

In a letter which he wrote in the *Castlebar Telegraph* of July 16th, he threatened he would do it, and in an epistle which he addressed to the Rev. M. A. Foster he says:—

“The flock given in charge to me shall not, please heaven, be overcome, without due resistance, by unprincipled tricksters in religion; neither shall the wolf in sheep's clothing be suffered amidst the fold.”

How the peaceful and inoffensive young men are to be “*banished*,” what is the “*due resistance*” that is to be given them—what is meant by not “*suffering*” them to be “*amidst the fold*” may be learned from the following document which the police have been obliged to issue.

“£30 Reward.

“Whereas, that on the 18th inst. as Henry Geo. Samuels, M. Harrigan, and Patt Connelly, scripture-readers, were on their way to Ballinamore church, County Mayo, a concourse of persons amounting to about three hundred, attacked them with stones, and hunted a dog at them, which tore the trowsers of Samuels and cut him on the thigh; and, whereas, on their return from church they were met and driven back,

“I hereby offer a reward of £30 to any person who will, within six months of this date, give such information as will lead to the arrest of the principal person, or of any one or more, of those who were engaged in this outrage. Payable on conviction.

“E. CHURCH, Sub-Inspector.

“Swinford, July 28th ’

We appeal in behalf of these humble scripture-readers to the

Protestants of this great empire, and ask them will they suffer priests and the fanatic rabbles that they command, to abolish civil and religious liberty in Ireland? We appeal to the government in behalf of men who have violated no law, and ask are these persecuted men to receive no protection and redress?

INSOLENT CONDUCT OF FATHER HEALY.

CASTLETOWN (BEREHAVEN) PETTY SESSIONS.

From the Cork Examiner.

On the Bench P. A. Armstrong, Jeremiah O'Connell, and J. Drummond R.M., Esqrs.

James Hazlett, Esq., S.I. v. Rev. Daniel Healy, P.P.

Mr. Hazlett examined—On the 25th ult. was proceeding to Ires to visit one of the police-stations; when passing the Rev. Mr. Healy's house was attacked by a vicious dog, which followed him a considerable distance along the road; directed one of the police to call on Mr. Healy to caution him, and to say, that he would be obliged to summon him for keeping such a vicious dog on the public road.

Mr. Hazlett then requested to have the policeman who went to Mr. Healy examined, as he had some evidence to give in the case. He also produced a letter which he had received from the Rev. Mr. Waller, complaining that an attack had been made on him by the same dog.

Father Healy exclaimed, O! the furious animal, shall I produce him? This is a case of bigotry and religious persecution.

Policeman examined—Went by direction of his officer to Mr. Healy: told him that he would be summoned for keeping his dog on the public road; that he had followed Mr. Hazlett when going to Ires on the 25th; Mr. Healy replied, "your officer is a blackguard and a ruffian to send such a message to a priest; that he would make mince meat of him when he would be summoned."

Father Healy—You have sworn what is false, and I will prove it on my oath; what I said was, that he was "impident" to send such a message to a priest.

Mr. Drummond—To say the least of it, Mr. Healy, such language was very unbecoming.

Father Healy—Oh, this gallant captain, this general officer; he was indeed like Alexander the Great, riding his Bucephalus going to fight, carrying a large sword, which his arm could not wield, and riding at such a furious rate that it is a wonder all the cats and dogs of the country don't run after him.

Court—This language is quite uncalled for; we really must put a stop to it.

Father Healy—This is a case of bigotry and persecution,

which I will report to the Lord Chancellor, and send through the public press. You (addressing the bench), want to make a Tory country of it, which you can't do, nor will you while I am in the country. If it was a Protestant clergyman (trembling with rage), allowed his dog to go as mine did, he would not be summoned. I have two cats, why don't you summon me for them? Will you allow me to show you this furious spaniel, this wicked animal, who frightened this gallant captain.

Bench—There is no necessity; but notwithstanding, his reverence produced a small terrier.

Mr. Hazlett—That is not the dog. After a while another (a furious looking cur dog) was produced, which Mr. Hazlett identified.

The Bench (interrupting)—The case is now before us, and let us decide on it.

Mr. O'Connell said, that he thought a nominal fine would be sufficient.

Dr. Armstrong said that he for one would not agree to a nominal fine, for if a poor person had acted a similar part the Bench would feel themselves called on to inflict the highest penalty.

The result was that Mr. Drummond agreed with him in imposing a fine of five shillings and costs.

Father Healy—The verdict is unjust and unfair; it is all bigotry.

Mr. Drummond—Your conduct, sir, is very improper, and I will feel it my duty to take steps against you if there is a single word more of disrespect used to the Bench.

Father Healy—I defy you. I stand here in defiance. Is it because you are a magistrate you consider yourselves better than me? I am as good a man as any of you. I will not log my dog or keep him off the road.

A PRIEST HELD TO BAIL IN THE SUM OF £10 FOR HIS *good* BEHAVIOUR.

CASTLEBAR PETTY SESSION.

Mary Gleeson, Margaret Brett, Daniel Gleeson, and Margaret Burke v. the Rev. Joseph Magennis.

For using threatening language to the complainants, at Ballyheane, on Saturday, the 2nd October, 1852.

Mr. Buchanan said—He appeared as counsel for the complainants in this case, and as such, had to complain of the rev. gentleman who appeared before them as defendant, inasmuch as he, the defendant, made use of violent and threatening language to the complainants. Daniel Gleeson, is a man of unimpeachable character, who has not made himself objectionable to any

one, who did not give the slightest offence or cause of offence to any one living; and yet what has been the course pursued toward this unoffending man and his wife? The rev. gentleman goes to where this man and his wife are living, and commences a tirade of abuse. He said to a person living in the neighbourhood, "Pretty neighbours you have got indeed, but I will soon clear them out of this; I promise you they will not remain long here." When the woman of the house heard the rev. gentleman abusing herself and her husband in this manner she came out of her house, and he accosted her thus—"Pray, madam, where have you come from; from Achill, I suppose; but I promise you that you will not make another Achill colony of this place; I will let you know Ballyheane is strong enough for you. I like a decent Protestant, but I will make such prowling vagabonds as you leave the place." That was not sufficient. He ordered the woman who let the house to those parties to go back to her house, and said, "I will make you feel the smart of it;" and further, "I pity you for what you have to undergo before the archdeacon on to-morrow."

Mr. Buchanan—I ask is it to be tolerated in a Christian country that these unoffending men, who merely go through the country for the purpose of reading the word of God to those, who, as I said before, express a desire to hear it, are to be hounded down, and reviled and abused in all possible shapes and forms? It is because a man shall dare to read the word of God in the native language of an Irishman—in that language which is so expressive, and through the medium of which the knowledge of the love and goodness of God can be best conveyed to the people of this country—is it, I ask again, because a man dares to do this in a Christian land, that he is not alone to be made the subject of the most virulent abuse, but that he is also to be held up as a fit and proper object upon which to let loose the unbridled and unlicensed passions of the excitable and sometimes ungovernable feelings of the vulgar and uneducated peasantry of this country. And, gentlemen, not only is this Scripture-reader the victim of all this vituperation and calumny, but his poor innocent wife is wantonly and ungraciously attacked; and I must add that if the rev. gentleman who now appears before you were possessed of any charitable or manly feeling, he would have waited for another and a better period to have wreaked his passion and his threats upon this helpless woman. Regardless of what might have been the effects of fulminating the thunders of the church and other violent threats upon that poor woman in her then weak and helpless condition, the rev. gentleman in a most violent and ungentlemanly manner, poured forth upon her and her family all the thunders and threats of the church, which were very near sending this poor woman before her time to eternity. In consequence of the violent language used to this poor woman,

she was obliged to take to her bed, and, I will show you, she was seized with a most dangerous illness; so much did these threats dwell upon her mind, that from that hour up to the present moment at the least noise her heart jumps from its place, and in her now alas! sleepless nights, she is constantly leaping up in her bed and frightened from her slumbers, fancying that the house is beset and torn from about her.

The charges being fully proved, the decision of the court was, that the Rev. Mr. Magennis should enter into bail, himself in £20 and two sureties for £10 each, for his good behaviour for one year.

PERSECUTING PRINCIPLES OF POPERY.

'From the Times.

We are not disposed to bewilder either ourselves or our readers with the exposure of those interminable contradictions on the subject of religious persecution into which Irish Papists have recently plunged; but it would be unwise in the extreme to neglect the opportunities which the present conjuncture affords of ascertaining and recording the true spirit of Popery, from its own avowals and proceedings. We are no longer left to deductions, however incontrovertible, from historical monuments or doctrinal codes. We can now behold the actual working of Popery at home and abroad, and observe its operations both in countries where it is dominant and in countries where it is only striving for dominion. It had been pretended that the genius of this religion had been grievously maligned, that persecution for opinion's sake formed no true part of its tenets, and that all examples to the contrary discoverable in past times were symptoms, not of the creed, but of the age, and common in such barbarous periods to all religions alike. The utter falsity of this extenuating plea is now manifest from the measure of dominant Popery at Florence. To the particular instances of persecution in those parts which have attracted the public notice and formal protest of Englishmen may now be added an undisguised avowal of the principles on which genuine persecution is based. In the dominions of the Grand Duke of Tuscany the punishment of death has been just revived for "offences against religion," under which phrase is comprehended every species of dissent from Popish authorities. A mere suspicion of such offences is punishable with imprisonment for three years. As far as control can be established over thoughts, it is committed unreservedly to the hands of the priesthood. All schools not under the immediate management of priests will at the expiration of twelve months from the present time be absolutely suppressed, and the amount,

degree, and nature of the instruction obtainable by the Tuscan people will be determined exclusively by that class of authorities who in Ireland have fanatically striven to obstruct all education whatever. To complete this picture of a state under Popish rule we may add what we have learnt from trustworthy sources, that the minds so rigorously debarred from knowledge are unhesitatingly surrendered to vice, and that the moral corruptions of gambling and debauchery are tolerated as serviceable diversions, preferable in the eyes of a priestly Government to habits of inquiry and independence.

Meanwhile, these very proceedings furnish the most incontestible refutation of the only argument which even the bigotry of a Lucas could discover in favour of such outrageous persecution. This gentleman, it will be recollected, maintained that the measures of the Tuscan government were justifiable by the laws of moral quarantine, and that the defence of the authorities was to be found in the exclusively Popish character of the population thus wisely protected against a new element of disorder. It is now perfectly clear that this alleged unanimity of belief has no existence. The population of Tuscany does number its Protestants as well as its Papists, and Mr. Lucas's argument tumbles to the ground. If the Madiais were arrested and warrantably so, on the sole ground of their being the only "heretics" in Tuscany, in what way are we to explain the arrests and committals which have followed on the self-same charges, the obvious apprehensions of the priesthood, and the increased rigour of operations suggested by so well-grounded a fear.

In point of fact, however, we are under no necessity of relying on such deductions, however evident or direct. The Attorney General of the Tuscan government did himself, in conducting the prosecution of the Madiais, demolish the single plea on which Popish rulers in Tuscany are defended by Popish pretenders in Ireland. "The work," said this officer, "most hidden, though extensive, is that of the sect called the Evangelical Confession, or the sect of the Pure Gospel, which is well known to be much extended in Florence and in other towns, as well as in the country." What better testimony could Mr. Lucas desire of a fact which he denies? Or at what particular stage of "extension" does he think a creed not only escapes the liability to punishment, but acquires the privilege of unbridled license?

We have already taken occasion to observe, that it is upon the true definition of "persecution," so artfully mystified by Popish writers, that this whole question hinges. The Church of Rome, unlike any other Christian community, has a double character. In one of these it has a right to all the freedom it can claim; in the other it is entitled to no rights whatever. In so far as it is an aggregate of Christians professing certain ritual

and doctrinal tenets, it has a claim to equality and protection in the eyes of the law. If Papists were subjected to any penalties or disabilities for believing in transubstantiation, for accepting seven sacraments instead of two, for withholding the cup from the laity, for kneeling at the elevation of the Host, for saying their prayers in a dead language, or for maintaining the verity of the latest French miracle, this would be persecution; but, in so far as the Church of Rome claims to be the possessor of indefeasible titles to dominion, and the representative of pretensions long ago condemned, it has no right whatever to any protection in the promotion of its arrogant demands. There was once a time when this church, besides being a church with a certain creed, was also a dominant and universal church, and in this capacity possessed of privileges for which a superiority over all temporal authorities was successfully claimed. The creed remains, but the privileges are in this country abolished. The former is clearly of the essence of the church, as to attack it would be persecution; the latter are as clearly accidents which can have no possible concern with the genuine duties of the priesthood, however gratifying they may be to its ambition. It is the invariable characteristic of Popish argument to confound these things together, and to represent the possession of title and dignity as no less essential to the administration of the church than the maintenance of its creed. The common sense of Englishmen, however, can readily effect the necessary distinction. When Papists are permitted not only to cherish their own convictions, and observe their own ritual, but even to push their proceedings to the very verge of gratuitous and offensive parade; and when the restrictions placed upon their acts affect nothing but pretensions which may damage the authority of the Crown, and scandalise the independence of the people, but which cannot possibly concern the offices of religion, it is easy for Englishmen to see, that there can here be no persecution at all.

THE RELIGION OF THE ANCIENT IRISH.

As one of the arguments used by those friendly to Maynooth is, that inasmuch as the religion of the people of Ireland was originally that of the Church of Rome, and that as the church property of the country formerly belonged to the ancestors of the present race, it is only fair, as this property was taken from them and given to the Protestants, to make them some restitution—to shew there is no real foundation for such an hypothesis, it may be necessary to advert very briefly to a few authentic facts connected with the early history of Ireland.

To enter at any length into such a subject, in a work like the present, it is evident would be altogether out of place; to a few of the more striking facts, however, it appears absolutely necessary to refer—for let the church property of Ireland belong to whom it may, one thing can be most distinctly demonstrated, that unless it belong to the Church of Rome, in virtue of our country having been conquered for Pope Adrian by Henry II., that church can have no claim to it whatever. That the portion of the church property which at that time fell into their hands, was originally given voluntarily to a church, or rather to a number of churches, differing as widely from the Church of Rome as the east does from the west, has been clearly proved, not only from authentic historical records, but from the evidence of ecclesiastics connected with Rome; and from the bulls and anathemas of popes, who for centuries endeavoured to establish their authority in Ireland, without being able to accomplish their purpose. That the Christian religion had been introduced, and Christian churches formed in Ireland a length of time previous to the arrival of any Romish missionary in the country, is generally admitted, even by Roman Catholic historians and writers. The abbe M'Geoghegan, Dr. O'Connor, Colgan, and numerous other Irish writers, admit the fact, as stated in the works of Archbishop Ussher, and, more recently, by Dr. Lannigan, Mr. Thomas Moore, and others.*

Extract from an epitome of Irish History as given in "Religious Statistics of Ireland," by Philip Dixon Hardy, M.R.I.A.

"As to the doctrines which were taught in those early days of the Irish Church, I may observe, that the sacred Scriptures, both in the original and vernacular, were their principal study. It was for this study that the schools of Ireland

* Mr. Thomas Moore—whose desire to maintain the honour of the Romish religion is well known—referring in his "History of Ireland" to this particular subject, admits the fact of the Christian religion having been established in Ireland before the time of Patrick. Quoting a passage from his Letter or Confession, in which he says he had "Visited remote places of the island, to which no preacher had gone before him," Mr. Moore observes, "This plainly implies, that in the more accessible parts of the country, Christianity had before his time been preached and practised." See History of Ireland, by T. Moore, Esq. vol. I. page 221.

were renowned.* We are informed by Bede, and he lived in the middle of the eighth century, that the rule of faith in all the Irish Churches was the Bible, and the Bible only—the same writer speaks of their ministers as most learned in the scriptures. And again, he mentions in his Ecclesiastical History, that the Irish observed only those works of piety and chastity, which they could learn in the prophetic, evangelical, and apostolical writings, that “the continual meditation of the scriptures was considered to give special vigour and vegetation to the soul;” while Columbanus says, “Let these be thy riches, the precepts of God’s law.”† “By means of which heavenly riches,” says Archbishop Ussher, “our ancient Scottish and Irish prospered so well, that many worthy persons in foreign parts were content to undergo a voluntary exile from their country, that they might freely traffic here for so excellent a commodity”—the Latin translation was in common use—but the Hebrew of the Old, and the Greek of the New Testaments, were those principally referred to by the learned divines of the day. In the extracts or quotations of the ancient Irish authors to whom I have referred, in various instances, the Greek, and not the Latin, is followed in the New; and in the Old Testament the Septuagint is adhered to.

Their views of the great leading doctrines of the Bible may be learned from the following: Sedulius, who lived at the close of the fifth century, observes, “Grace only makes the distinction between the redeemed and the lost, who, by a cause drawn from their common original, were created together in one mass of perdition.” Again, “all mankind stood condemned in the apostatical root;” by the law, “comes neither the remission, nor the removal, but the knowledge of sin;” that “our sins are gratuitously forgiven us, without the merit of our works;” that, therefore, we are to rejoice, “not in our own righteousness, or learning, but in the faith of the cross, by which all our sins are forgiven us;” that “we esteem basely of Christ, when we think he is not sufficient for us to salvation,” and that “as the soul is the life of the body, so faith is the life of the soul.” That “the root of righteousness does not grow out of good works, but the fruit of works out of the root of righteousness.”‡

* *Superna quoque gratia se praeveniente, tanto studio divinas epotavit (Gallus) scripturas, ut de thesauro suo nova proferre posset et vetera. Obscura autem scripturarum tam sapienter, scire volentibus, reseravit, ut cuncti, qui ejus (utpote pueri) prudentiam et sermones audierant, admiratione eum et laude dignissimum judicarent.—Walafridus Strabo, in vita sancti—Galli. l. 1. c. 1.*

† See Bed. Eccl. His. lib. 3. Sedul. and Claud Gal. 6. Ib. in Rom. 4; and Columb. in monast.

‡ Claud. lib. 2. Sedul. Carm. Paschal, in 1 Cor. 11. cum aliis antiquioribus innumeris.

These, and many like excellent sentences, which might be culled from the writings of the Irish divines of the fifth, sixth, seventh, and eighth, centuries, will sufficiently show the reader that the doctrines held by the first Christian churches of Ireland were perfectly in accordance with those which were delivered to the saints by our Lord and his apostles; and in no way savoured of the errors of Popery.

It will be seen also from the authorities quoted, that the early Christians neither believed in a purgatory nor in the efficacy of prayers for the dead. The first person by whom the idea of a purgatory was mentioned, was Henry, the monk of Saltrey, who lived in the year 1153; at a time when Romish errors were widely diffused through the land. It is true that prayers were frequently offered after the decease of eminent and godly characters; but these were merely thanksgivings to God for his mercy to the individuals, and by no means intended as a propitiation for their sins.*

In a work written by St. Patrick, about the year 440, it is said, "there are THREE habitations under the power of Almighty God; the first, the lowermost, and the middle; that is, heaven, hell, and earth. The extremes are altogether contrary to each other; but the middle has some similitude to the extremes; for in this world there is a mixture of the bad and good together; whereas, in the kingdom of God, there are none bad, but all good; but in hell there are none good, but all bad; and both these places are supplied out of the middle: for of the men of this world, some are lifted up to heaven, and others drawn down to hell: like are joined to like, good to good, and bad to bad; just men to just angels, wicked men to wicked angels; the servants of God to God, the servants of the devil to the devil; the blessed are called to the kingdom of God, prepared for them from the beginning of the world; the cursed are driven into everlasting fire, prepared for the devil and his angels."†

This fully accords with the advice given by St. Hieronymus in the year 410, as quoted by Claudius Scotus, about 815, that "while we are in this present world we may be able to help one another, either by our prayers or our councils, but when we shall come before the judgment seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah, can entreat for any one, but every one must bear his own burden."‡

* * * * *

With regard to the Confessional, it is clear, from ancient his-

* Cot. edit. ab Usser. in Epis. Hib. Syllogi.

† Patric. de Trib. Habit. MS. Bib. Reg. Jacobæ.

‡ Dum in præsentī seculo sumus, sive orationibus, sive consiliis invicem posse nos adjuvari; cum autem ante tribunal Christi venerimus, nec Job, nec Daniel, nec Noe, rogare posse pro quoquam; sed unumquemque portare onus suum.—*Claud. in Galat. vi.*

tory, that the Irish would not submit to it, till Malachy, the pope's emissary, forced it upon them. Bernard, who wrote in the twelfth century, in his life of that ecclesiastic, bitterly complains of this; he says, they "would not go to confession; that neither would the laity undertake any penance, nor their priests impose it;" that "Malachy instituted the most salutary practice of Confession, and the sacrifice of confirmation."* While Alcuinus, a Romish priest who lived at the close of the eighth century, complains, in writing of the Irish, that "no man of the laity will make his confession to the priests."† The ancient Irish, we are informed, "confessed to God alone, believing that God alone could forgive sins."

* * * * *

As to the priest forgiving sins, the ancient Irish believed that "God alone could forgive sins;" and Bede, although an English ecclesiastic, in writing on the ninth chapter of Matthew, thus proves the divinity of the Saviour.

In their churches they had no images or statues, which Sedulius and Claudius expressly condemn, and which other writers brand as heathenish and idolatrous.‡

It is agreed by nearly all historians that in the sixth and seventh centuries there were, at least, three hundred and sixty churches in Ireland, each church having its own bishop or pastor, completely independent of foreign influence. On this point Archbishop Ussher observes, "We read in Nennius, that at the beginning, St. Patrick founded here three hundred and sixty-five churches, and ordained three hundred and sixty-five bishops, besides three thousand Presbyters. In process of time the number of bishops was daily multiplied, according to the pleasure of the metropolitan, (whereof Bernard much complains); and that, not only so far that every church almost had a separate bishop, but that in some "towns or cities, there were appointed more than one; yea, and oftentimes bishops were made without having any certain bishoprics assigned to them."

* * * * *

From these various statements of Romish writers, it appears certain that in the middle of the seventh century, Rome had gained no footing in the country—that at that time the Irish Churches were not considered as connected with Rome, is also evident from the fact, that though the English churches were represented by their bishops in the Council of Nice—those of

* Usus saluberimum confessionis sacramentum confirmationis, contractum conjugiorum (*quae omnia aut ignorabant aut negligebant*) Malachias de novo instituit.—*In vita Malachiae*, c. 2.

† Alcuin. Epist. 26.

‡ Recedentes a lumine veritatis sapientes, quasi qui invenissent quod modo invisibilis Deus, per simulacrum visibile coleretur.—*In Roman* 1.—Deus nec in metallo aut saxo cognoscitur.—*Claudius. Scotus*, 1. 2. *in mat.*

Ireland were not. This is still further made apparent by what Bede mentions, that "no one had even furnished them with the Synodal decrees for the Paschal observance."

When, in the ninth century, the doctrine of Transubstantiation was first broached by the Church of Rome, it was at once attacked by Johannes Erigena, well known as a favourite of Charles the Bald—who had to fly from that court and country in consequence of himself and his book being condemned by the then reigning pope, who had no other way of confuting it.*

That the churches in Ireland were in no way connected with Rome is also proved beyond a doubt by various remonstrances from popes and others. Thus, Honorius I. in the seventh century, exhorts the Irish "not to esteem their own small number, seated in the extremities of the earth, to be wiser than the ancient or modern churches of Christ throughout the world."† And again, Cummian, a proselyte to Rome, writing to Segian, Abbot of Columkill, desires him to consider which is most likely to be right, the Greeks, Romans, and Egyptians, or a parcel of Britons and Irish.‡

Dr. Lanigan in his Ecclesiastical History, as well as several other Romish historians, in reference to the usurpations of Henry, speak of its having been effected by bribed and treacherous Ecclesiastics, acting in concert with foreign emissaries;§ and when an effort was made to enforce uniformity in modes of worship, and to establish compulsory taxation for the support of religion, we are informed by these same Romish Historians, that "the Irish people and clergy disregarded these decrees passed in foreign synods, and continued to observe only their own ecclesiastical rules."

From the dates of the foregoing particulars it will be seen that the Irish Christians were the last on the face of the globe

* *Johannus Scote liber de Eucharistia lectus est et condemnatus.—Lanfranc de Eucharist. contra Berengar. Inter cetera fecit librum de Eucharistia qui postea lectus est, et condemnatus in synodo vercellensi, a papa Leone celebrata.—Joan Paris ad annum 877.*

† Exhortans, ne paucitatem suam in extremis terra finibus constitutam sapientiores antiquis sive modernis, que per orbem terre sunt, Christi ecclesiis æstimarent.—*Bed. His. Eccles.* l. 2. c. 19.—*Videatur etiam fusim de hac re.* l. 3. c. 25.

‡ Vos considerate—utrum Hebræi, et Græci, et Latini, & Ægypti, simul in observatione præcipuarum solemnitatem uniti; au Britonum Scotorumque particula qui sunt pene extremi, et (ut ita dicam) mentagrarum orbis terrarum.—*Cummian Hiberni ad Segianum Huensem Abbatem Epistole M.S. in Bibliotheca Canton et edit. ab Usser. in Epistole Hybernica Syllogi.*

§ Even Mr. Thomas Moore, treating of this transaction, in his History of Ireland, observes in reference to the Bull of Adrian to Henry, that it "was accompanied by a stipulation for the payment to St. Peter, of a penny annually from every house in Ireland, this being the price for which the independence of the Irish people was thus bartered away."

to submit to the domination of the Romish See; and that they did not submit till forced by the sword of a tyrant, aided by the powers of a pope. Numbers emigrated to other lands, and the remainder were forced to submit.* So great was their abhorrence of the intolerance of Rome, that they even refused to admit a legate from the pope to a conference, nor would they sit at meat with one of his emissaries.† These are historical facts—all of them capable of the fullest proof—and most of them admitted by Protestant and Romish historians; the entire clearly proving that when the rest of Christendom had yielded up their consciences to the keeping of their priests, and the rights and exercises of private judgment were lost sight of, the Irish Christians maintained their privileges. Speaking on these points, Mosheim observes :

“The Irish or Hibernians, who, in this century, were known by the name of *Scots*, were the only divines who refused to dishonour their reason by submitting implicitly to the dictates of authority.” And again “the Irish doctors alone, and particularly Johannes Scotus, had the courage to spurn the ignominious fetters of authority, and to explain the sublime doctrines of Christianity in a manner conformable with the dictates of reason, and the principles of true philosophy. But this noble attempt drew upon them the malignant fury of a superstitious age, and exposed them to the hatred of the Latin theologists, who would not permit either reason or philosophy to meddle themselves in religious matters”—*Cent. 9, c. 3, sec. 10.*

I would, therefore, now ask any impartial individual to say, after reading the documents which I have submitted, what can we think of the claim of the Pope of Rome at the present day, as to ecclesiastical jurisdiction in Ireland? Has he, or have the Roman Catholics, any other claim than that which would be made by a robber to property he himself had stolen? And what must we think of the opinions of men in power, who, to please and gratify the priests of Rome, feel no objection to the Roman Catholic religion being maintained and supported by the State, as the ancient religion of the country.‡

* Dr. Chalmers in his “*Caledonia*,” says “The Culdges gradually fell a sacrifice to the Moloch of superstition—but it was upon the altar of their ancient faith.”

† Nam Daganus Episcopus ad non veniens, non solum cibum nobiscum sed nec in eodum hospitio quo viscebamur, sumere voluit.—*Bed. His. Eccles. 1. 2. c. 4.*

‡ See Lord John Russell’s Speech, p. 100.

WORKS ON POPERY,

BY PHILIP DIXON HARDY, M.R.I.A.

RELIGIOUS STATISTICS OF IRELAND, Containing an accurate statement of the relative number of Romanists and Protestants of every denomination, the number of Chapels, Colleges, Monasteries, Nunneries, Priests and Friars, and the various Confraternities connected with the Romish Church in Ireland, with an accurate description of the System of Education in Maynooth. Limp 8vo. 2s. 6d.

"One of the most interesting and important works that we have seen on the true state of that unhappy country. He strikes at once at the root of Ireland's misery."—*Christian Guardian*.

THE PROGRESS OF THE CONFESSIONAL, or the System of Theology taught at the College of Maynooth, Ireland, clearly showing that the questions propounded by Priests in the Confessional are such as should not be mentioned in the hearing of a modest female; with an Appendix containing the Melancholy History of a Young Nun.—Fearful Picture of a Priest's Position as an Unmarried Confessor.—The Jesuit Spy.—Father Gavazzi on Celibacy, &c. &c. &c. Third Edition, fcp. 8vo. with an Engraving, 8d; cloth, 1s.

"The author has accumulated facts of the most convincing nature connected with the system of hypocrisy and profligacy carried on by the priests and their penitents, under the mask of religion."—*Warder*.

THE INQUISITION; its History, Influences, and Effects, from its first establishment to the present time, including its recent proceedings relative to Dr. Achilli, and several engravings portraying the tortures of the Inquisition. 5th Thousand. 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

"This most seasonable little book we earnestly recommend to the perusal of our readers, and of all who need to be acquainted with the diabolism of Popery. It contains a great variety of documents, both ancient and modern, respecting the origin and history of the Inquisition, and brings the details down to within a few months." * * * *Christian Examiner*.

"We say to Romanists and Protestants, read Mr. Hardy's little detail of historical facts connected with this tribunal, and then tell us, in the exercise of common candour, whether the blood-stained church which has in all ages to the utmost of her power, trampled on the liberties of mankind, and rioted in the suffering of all who ventured to question her authority, is not indeed the harlot seen by St. John in prophetic vision, 'drunken with the blood of the saints,' and with the blood of the martyrs of Jesus."—*Achill Herald*.

"This publication, already in its fourth thousand, is remarkably opportune, as contributing materially to illustrate a most important subject, at the present hour. * * * It exhibits, what may be called the most striking features of the Pandemonium Chronicle of savage cruelty, as practised in an Inquisition."—*Christian Witness*.

Works on Popery, by P. Dixon Hardy, M.R.I.A.

THE GENIUS OF POPERY OPPOSED TO THE PRINCIPLES OF CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. 18mo. cloth, 1s. 6d.

"This volume, like the foregoing, is extremely seasonable. Its object is different; its flight is loftier; it addresses itself to a higher order of mind, and approaches the precincts of morality and legislation. It is an exhibition of Popery in its fuller development, showing its utter incompatibility with civil and religious liberty—that such liberties have ever expired wherever it became established, and that they can never be established where it is in the ascendant—that they are in a state of constant and eternal antagonism, and never can be reconciled. * * * We ask for this work also an extensive circulation, since it is excellently suited for the more intelligent portion of the general public."—*Christian Witness*.

"A clever and comprehensive exhibition of the many horrors and abominations of apostate Rome, presenting that foul system in its hideous enormity, and throwing light on the genuine character of that 'mother of harlots,' that should not be called a church, but rather 'the synagogue of Satan.'"—*Christian Examiner*.

THE HOLY WELLS OF IRELAND, containing an Authentic Account of those Places of Pilgrimage and Penance which are still annually visited by thousands of the Roman Catholic Peasantry. With a minute description of the Patterns and Stations periodically held in various districts of Ireland. 18mo. cloth, with numerous Engravings, 1s. 6d.

"Not only an exceedingly interesting publication, but calculated also to be truly useful."—*Christian Examiner*.

THE NORTHERN COTTAGE; or the Effects of Bible Reading. 18mo. 6d.

In reference to the foregoing works, the Publishers are authorised to insert the annexed testimonial of the effects of their general circulation—

"I beg to say that I consider them highly useful, calculated to open the eyes not only of ignorant Protestants, as to the principles of the Church of Rome, but what is of much more importance, to enlighten our Roman Catholic countrymen, and to show them the iniquity of that system, by which they are so fearfully blinded and deceived.

"Your faithful servant,

"Mr. P. D. HARDY.

"R. J. M'GHEE."

As these works are admirably adapted for extensive circulation at the present important crisis, a considerable allowance will be made to those purchasing in quantities for gratuitous distribution.

DUBLIN: HARDY AND SONS, 23, UP. SACKVILLE-STREET.
LONDON: BLACKADER, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY

BX
920
M36H37

Hardy, Philip Dixon
The Maynooth grant

